

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1869.

ART. I.—THE WRITTEN AND THE INCARNATE WORD.

BY REV. P. S. DAVIS, A. M., CHAMBERSBURG, PA.

It may startle the Bibliolaters of the present day, to see it asserted that the written word of God, without the *Incarnate Word* is an unfulfilled promise. Any such statement may be regarded by many thoughtless persons as a blasphemous attack upon the Bible, and even upon the character of Him who has so mercifully given it to us. We protest against this, however; claiming most confidently that the only view that puts honor on the Scriptures and vindicates the Almighty is that which apprehends all that He has written as yea and Amen *in Christ Jesus.* (2 Cor. i. 20).

We believe that there are thousands of well meaning men, who fail to apprehend this fact. This is wonderfully illustrated in the reports and addresses we hear when we assemble in our laudable zeal for the dissemination of the Scriptures. We have often felt very painfully that if some intelligent pagan like Socrates, Plato, or Cicero, were to come into some of these meetings and judge simply from what he might hear, he would conclude that the "orator" employed, was urging men to stake their salvation upon a book or theory contained in it, rather than in a personal Redeemer. An old Roman would doubtless be impressed with the fact that here were some Sybilline leaves

which no proud Tarquin could refuse to buy, without great peril to himself and the world ; but of the fact that God became man for us men and our salvation, he might be left in complete ignorance. In a sermon expressly prepared for such an occasion, a few years ago, the name of Christ was only mentioned once, and then by way of rhetorical flourish, in connection with the United States flag ; and in a lately published report of a Bible Society the Saviour is scarcely alluded to, except in a perverted passage of the Scriptures, to which we may refer more particularly in the course of this article.

If it be said in answer to all this, that it is superfluous to say anything about Christ on these occasions, as His Being and work are pre-supposed, we reply that while this may hold good, as far as business statements are concerned, it will not excuse those parts of the reports, sermons and addresses in which the reasons for circulating the Scriptures are so elaborately set forth. We have before us one of these addresses, which we thought worthy of being substantially bound a good while ago, and to which we often refer as a type of many we have heard since. In it, young men are exhorted to study and circulate the Scriptures on account of their "literary merits." And then we have a flaming panegyric upon the poetry, and marvelously narrated incidents of the Bible, supported by the testimony of such men as John Milton, Sir Matthew Hale, and Sir William Jones. This is all well enough, if God's Holy Word needs to be upheld by human opinions, but it always seems to us like complimenting that which is Divine.* Now we know well enough that the Holy Scriptures are the best literature in the world, that they are as high above any human composition as God is above man, but we do not circulate them because of their literary merits. That would not constitute a sufficient reason for sending them to the heathen, and indeed, the mass of mankind even in Christian lands cannot be expected to have any literary tastes. In fact it is not a primary design of the Bible to cultivate or answer the demands of literary taste, the fancy literature of the modern pulpit to the

* Unfortunately our author cites Rousseau as saying things equally complimentary, and we can hardly help asking "Cui Bono?"

contrary notwithstanding. What pastor in his visitations among the afflicted, would read a chapter from the book of Job, merely as part of a splendid epic? Who would read one of our Saviour's sublime parables simply to point out its beauty of conception and expression? It would be sad indeed, if we were obliged to say to any poor ignorant penitent, "Here is a touching *description* of the crucifixion, but a man must be a *belle lettres* scholar to come to a proper appreciation of it." It would afford but little comfort to a dying man, however great a biblical scholar, or admirer of beautiful things said in the Scriptures he might be, if after all its poetry and philosophy there were no real Personal Redeemer who not only spake as never man spake, but was able to save even unto the uttermost.

And yet here we have a discourse in which the Bible is set for the salvation of the world, at best, as a beautiful system of ethics or morals, through about the same process to all appearance, in which the writings of Plato and Seneca, permeated the minds, and influenced the lives of the old Greeks and Romans. The name of Christ is mentioned but twice;—once in a text quoted in an anecdote, told about Flavel's preaching, and once in a parenthetical clause which is followed by a quotation from Lord Byron, by way of climax.

As "scholars," "patriots," and "accountable beings," we are plainly told "*the Bible*," (not Christ) "*is our only safety*." The Scriptures are every where put in the place of Christ instead of leading to Him.

Against all of this we most solemnly protest, alleging confidently, that this is not honoring the written word of God, but wrenching it from its true position as testifying of Him, to whom the hopes of man are linked. And we make this assertion all the more confidently, because the Bible itself, as well as the facts in the case, will bear us out in it.

If the Scripture, all of which is profitable, is able to make any Timothy wise unto salvation, it is "through faith which is in *Christ Jesus*." (2 Tim. iii. 15). "This is life eternal," says our Divine Redeemer; not that they may be Biblical scholars, or know theological science, but "that they may know *Thee*, the

only true God, and *Jesus Christ* whom Thou hast sent." (John xvii. 3). The highest revelation then, that God has made to man, and the only revelation that is life-giving is not through His written word, but through the "Word made flesh." He was that *Word of life* (*λόγον ζωῆς επέκουντες*), that the Philippians were to hold forth.

The Mosaic account of the creation written of course long after the events recorded had taken place, was not intended to be a treatise on astronomy or a system of geology through which men are to grope their way by *a posteriori* arguments back to God. Man could not by thus searching find out the Almighty, and if he could, his inductive reasoning might lead him to inquiries beyond the existence of God. Instead of being discovered *by* man He revealed Himself *to* man as *The Absolute*. When He did thus reveal Himself, it was not simply to declare what He would *say* to him in the way of instruction, but what He had *done* in the way of creation and what He would *do* in the way of redemption. It was not simply to declare what He *was from all eternity*, but what He would *become in time*, in order to save man from his lost estate. Satan had ruined man and made his whole heritage subject to vanity. With the whole constitution of his being and of the world thus impaired by sin, no mere enlightenment of his mind, even from above, and no divine psalmody put in his mouth, could stay the process of disintegration and death. The evil one was master of the situation, possessing the inmost citadel of man's being, and until a stronger one would come, he would hold his goods in peace, whatever might be *said to us or of us*. To deliver man from this estate, required not simply a spoken or a written word, but a Personal Redeemer and a real *work*.

It was not sufficient then that God should reveal Himself to man, merely *as* God, giving him written statutes and encouraging him with promises. He must be "manifested in the flesh" in order to impart a new life to our humanity, and *accomplish* our salvation in a most actual way by redemptive *acts*. Only in this way could the awful law of sin and death which is working in us be met and overcome. Accordingly the first an-

nouncement of God to fallen man is not, “I will *speak* to you from the cloud ; I will give you a sublime system of morals, and cause my words of warning and promise to be written and even printed and distributed centuries after this ; but “The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent’s head.”

To this great event everything now looked. The law was given as a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ. Of Him did all the prophets speak. The Shekinah shining between the cherubim was but a type of that more perfect tabernacle by which He was to come. The high-priest with the sprinkled blood and entrance within the veil was to show men that these sacrifices could never make the comers thereto perfect, and point to the Great High-priest of our profession, who was to offer Himself once for all, and then pass into the heavens to intercede for us. Meanwhile the paschal supper, the deliverance from Egypt, the feeding with manna—all looked forward to the mysteries of grace in that promised seed. Indeed we cannot say that this or that prophecy or event is Messianic, and that others are not, for every word, and every thing, down to Gabriel’s announcement to the Virgin Mother (Luke i. 28), was not simply an evidence of but a preparation *for* the coming of the Christ of God. The whole history of Judaism and of the world was but a voice in the wilderness saying, “Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight.”

Then, “when the fullness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.” In His own person God and man were brought to a real atonement. He fulfilled all righteousness, and by the power brought into the service of our humanity, redeemed it in the most actual way from sin and death. He is now the one in whom our hopes are centred, and of course the proper object of our faith. Without a knowledge of Him, we repeat, we can have no life, (John xvii. 3), and all mere biblical learning, which so many think has its end in itself, cannot help us.

This assertion is sustained by the rebuke which the Saviour gave the Jews on this very subject. “Ye search the Scrip-

tures," said He, "for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me." (John v. 39). We know that the verb "search" (*ερευνᾶτε*) is here rendered in our received English version in the imperative mood as if it enjoined a command; and that the whole passage in the mouth of many a man is made to teach: That we must search the Scriptures, *because* in them we have eternal life. It may not be superfluous on this account to say that while we may be commanded in other places to study God's word, *this* passage teaches no such thing; that *ερευνᾶτε* is in the indicative mood, and that the Saviour here charges the Jews with making a ruinous use of the Scriptures, by supposing them to terminate on themselves as life-giving, rather than designed to testify of Him.

The Jews did search the Scriptures, as the Saviour here declares; they *searched* them, as the word expresses it, as the lioness deprived of her whelps scour the plain and traces the footsteps of man. At the time of our Saviour they had not the New Testament, as we know, but they made vast account of the study of the old. The Talmud represents God as saying to David, "I am better pleased with one day in which thou sittest and studiest the law than I shall be with a thousand sacrifices which thy son Solomon shall offer upon mine altar."* How fully the study of the law and the prophets entered into their minds in the days of our Saviour, no one who reads the gospels need be told. They were ever trying to measure Him by tests derived from that source.

For their study of the Scriptures they had various motives, just as men have now. One was to become *wise* in them. They wished to be like Solomon, who had said, "The wise man will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients, * * * he will keep sayings of the renowned men, and enter withal into the subtleties of parables. He will search out the hidden meaning of proverbs, and will be conversant in the secrets of parables." This all showed itself in the sayings which the Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, Doctors, Priests and Scribes brought

* Tract Shabbath, fol. 30.

against the Son of God, and which He turned against them, vanquishing them on their own field and with their own weapons, and declaring, "Behold a greater than Solomon is here." Besides this they thought they might gain eternal life by the study of the word of God. One of their Talmudic sayings was, "He who studies daily in the law is worthy to have a portion in the world to come."* When the coming of the Messiah was more immediately expected their researches were greatly stimulated; but they thought that when He would come, eternal life would accrue to them, not as flowing from His Divine human Person, but as a reward of their knowledge of, as well as their obedience to the law. "In *them*," says the Saviour, "ye think† ye have eternal life."‡ And yet all of their searching of their Scriptures, and all the veneration they had for every jot and tittle that had been written, was of no avail, because they ignored Him of whom all was to testify. "They are they which testify of *me*," says the Saviour, "and ye will not come unto me that ye may have eternal life."

The mere Scriptures, then, are not sufficient in themselves to give us eternal life. Indeed, God never intended to make our salvation dependent upon a written word, but upon a life-giving Seed, and unless that Seed had come and bruised the serpent's head, all prophecies would have remained mere predictions, making a promise to our ear and breaking it to our hopes. Everything must be yea and amen in Christ Jesus. So it is too when we come to the New Testament. The *fact* of an accomplished righteousness wrought out in Christ must, of course, underlie any mere account of it. If the Gospel were

* Sohor. Genes. fol. 31.

† "Ye think," *douclre*, more probably *ye suppose*. This word as here used is generally applied in the Gospels to some conceit of man's that needs be guarded against and corrected. Thus Matt. iii. 9. "Think not" (*μὴ δόξῃτε*) i. e., suppose not wrongly "to say within yourselves we have Abraham to our father." Again, Matt. v. 6. "But when ye pray use not vain repetitions as the heathen do: for they think (*δοκοῦσι*) i. e. wrongly suppose they shall be heard for their much speaking." So throughout.

‡ *ζωή ἡνίκα αἰώνιον*. John v. 39, vide also John vi. 40, *αἰώνιον* from *αἰτί* always, and *ων* participle of *εἰμι* to be. Always existing. Were the Scriptures themselves always existing? How can we predicate the "always existing life" except in the *λόγος*?

a mere statement without any fact corresponding with and answering to it, it would, of course, be a mere fiction. This accomplished redemption might be a reality without any written account of it, but the reverse of this is not true. Things are not only true because they are in the Bible, but in the Bible because they are true. The Kingdom of grace had an existence in fact and was working its results in the hearts of men and in the world long before any account of it was committed to parchment. Indeed a great part of the Bible is history which could not be recorded until after it had been enacted. It was a long time before this glorious work was commenced. The last book of St. John was not written until A. D. 96, and 393 years elapsed between the birth of Christ and the Ecumenical Council at Hippo, which separated the inspired writings from the spurious books that knocked for admission into the canon ; so that St. Stephen and many others had gone to glory before one word of the New Testament had been written. Men could be saved then without the written word, but they could not be saved without the living Christ. Even now the ability to *read* is not necessary to salvation. Indeed the *preached* word is the ordained instrumentality by which Christ is to be presented to men, (Mark xvi. 15.) There may be different forms of announcing the Gospel, but it would be a fiction in any case, whether spoken or written, if there were no real facts answering to the declarations. This should not depreciate the Scriptures in our eyes to whom in these last times they have come, but only serve to place them in their proper relation, by showing that their true value rests in the historical realities of a Kingdom of grace whose head is a Personal Redeemer.

It seems strange that so many people are always confounding the Scriptures with Christ ; that so many fail to see the relative position of the two in the economy of salvation, and that any attempt to make the proper distinction between the two is at once denounced as an attempt to depress the Bible below its proper valuation. And yet no one can have a just appreciation of God's written word except he sees it in its relation to the Word Incarnate. He may talk as piously as he

pleases about "precious promises," but after all they will be *nothing more* than promises unless there is a Saving One, in whom they find their fulfillment. And the failure of many such a man is, that he is always descanting with Pharisaic sanctimony upon "comforting doctrines," rather than pointing to "Him who is mighty to deliver."

A man may come to the Bible with his own preconceived notions of its teachings, as men generally do; or he may construct any theory out of the Scriptures. He may be a Calvinist or an Arminian, a Pedo-baptist or an Anabaptist; he may turn Pelagian if he is afraid of a sacramental grace, through which the natural depravity of children finds its counterpart in the Second Adam; he may even come with the self-constructed moulds of the Universalist. For notwithstanding all the praises with which the Bible is bespattered it is only, in the opinion of many, so much potter's clay, that every man may fashion as he listeth. Only so he is *sincere* and professes to hold the Bible as the only infallible rule of faith, no one else has a right to cavil. So great is the Diana of private judgment that all the world bows down before her; and baptizing latitudinarianism in the name of charity and freedom, renders this verdict: "You must agree to disagree; every man, especially in the United States, has a right to his honest convictions, and so the Bible can mean only what every man chooses to make it mean."

Meanwhile, even within the range of John Knoxian orthodoxy, the ranks of the sacramental host are bristling with the pikes and bayonets of controversy, and the Word of God is the armory from which all parties profess to bring their weapons. Professing Christians are contending for doctrines and phases of doctrines which lie away out in the periphery, while the personal Saviour—the great central Sun—is obscured by the dust and smoke of the conflict.* Men almost everywhere seem to be trying to work their way from and through theological

* We know it is often said in palliation of all this, "We agree on essential points and differ on non-essentials." But let any brother imagine his non-essentials are infringed upon in a union meeting or in the struggle for the spoils after a "joint

systems, into the Christological centre, rather than start with the Christological centre, and find in the person and work of Christ, the key to every mystery that lies beyond. No wonder, when they try to lead their congregations to Christ through labyrinths of doctrines, that the captains themselves should be confused and lost in the winding galleries, and the host refuse to follow. No wonder, if their salvation depends upon a system of theology rather than a Person, that they should bring all their powers of logic to uphold it, and display all their ornamental scholarship to embellish it. No wonder, if all is to stand in the reason of men, or in the poetical charm that oratory may give it, that they should set out to *prove* the gospel instead of *preaching* it, (Mark xvi. 15, Acts v. 43, 2 Tim. iv. 2), and to *make* the faith instead of *keeping* it. (1 Tim. vi. 20, 2 Tim. iv. 7). No wonder that they should fly entirely out of their orbits, running into the vagaries of sensational preaching, and finding or forcing a text to suit every flippant event that pops up before the public eye. All this may be very pleasant to itching ears, but there is no Christ in it.

Nor do we find any compensation for all this in the fact that this class of men make a great ado in preaching *about* preaching Christ, and claim the Apostles as their great exemplars. People are beginning to see through all this, notwithstanding the fact that the brother who "follows in prayer" may laud the evangelical spirit of "the brother who has just taken his seat," to the congregation, over the shoulders of the Almighty.

The Apostles never preached simply *about* preaching the gospel. "They ceased not to preach Jesus Christ." (Acts v. 42). Any one who reads the sermons recorded in the book of Acts must be struck with their historical character; no speculation, no boasting of proclaiming good news without telling what the good news was, but matter of fact statements of who Christ is and what He has done to save man. And the epistles of Paul are full of epitomes which showed the good

"effort" is over, and see if his regard for essentials will hold the non-essentials in abeyance. Which then are the essentials? Which shows itself to be the stronger force, the centrifugal or the centripetal? That which tends to the circumference, or binds to the centre?

news he proclaimed to be, not a syren song, but the great world fact, that God was manifested in the flesh for our redemption. "All things," he says, "are of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given us the ministry of reconciliation: To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation. Now then we are ambassadors," &c., (2 Cor. v. 18, et seq.). Again, "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is the word of faith which we preach: That if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus,"—not a theory but a Person—"that if thou confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead"—the fundamental miracle of His triumph—"if thou shalt believe that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. x. 8).

Such quotations might easily be multiplied, but these will suffice to show that the gospel of the Apostles was not an empty sound. The facts of the Incarnation and Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ were the truths they set forth. These facts gave the Scriptures their value in their minds. This was the value our Saviour Himself gave to them when He opened them to His disciples on the way to Emmaus, and caused their hearts to burn within them. For no other purpose did the Apostles use that which had been written before the coming of Christ. Thus in the synagogue of the Jews at Thessalonica, we are told, that "Paul, as his manner was, went in among them, and three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered and risen again, and this Jesus whom I preach unto you is *Christ*."

This was written all over the Old Testament Scriptures. It was the focal centre to which every ray converged. They everywhere and always pointed to the Christ of God. That Christ, with all their searching of their Scriptures, the Jews failed to recognize—a terrible warning to men in any age, who read the Bible for theories and systems upon which to rest in

the way of creed, without the least apparent conception that the written word without the Incarnate Word is a promise unfulfilled; and that if men are to have life at all it is not to be through a doctrine but through a *Person*.

The highest form of revealed truth is not in mere speech or theory, however Divine. To be an actualized reality for us it must become Incarnate. When the Apostle said, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself," he announced the great "*Mystery of Godliness*," that is, the sublime mysterious *fact* of an accomplished godly state and character, brought about by the infleshment of the second person of the Trinity. So Jesus says, "*I am the way, the truth and the life.*" *I am the way*, i. e., the real at-one-ment of the Divine and human was effected in my conception by the Holy Ghost and my birth of the virgin Mary. God and man thus became one vitally in my person, and I am the only bond of union between the two. "No man knoweth the Son but the Father: neither knoweth any man the Father save the Son and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him;" and "no man cometh to the Father but by me." So too *I am the truth*, that is, I am the absolute truth, as God in His essential Being is the absolute truth, and as man raised up in my person to correspondence with the character of God is the realization of truth. Here is the *living Truth*. So too, again, He says, *I am the life*, setting forth the fact that the life was in the constitution of His Person. And in His Person, rather than in any mere theory about Him, men are to find the principle and never-failing fountain of life. The most "*evangelical*" passages of Scripture, as men call them, prove this. "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in *Him* should not perish but have everlasting *life*." "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in *Him* should not perish but have eternal *life*." (John iii). "In *Him* was life, and the *life was the light of men.*" (John i. 4).

Men just reverse this, and here is a fundamental error that has wrong-shipped much of the theology of the day; a tap root

from which not only theoretical heresies but practical evils have long been growing. The common conception is that the *light is to be the life of men*—just the *reverse* of what the apostle tells us in the passage quoted above. This conception starts out with a doctrine rather than a person, whereas the Bible itself, always represents life as flowing to us only by union with Him, who *is* Himself our life. Col. iii. 4.

Now according to the organic constitution of the church which is to increase mainly from within itself, our children are baptized into Him before they are capable of receiving instruction. In the case of adults who are out of Christ, there must be now, as in the beginning, a preaching of the Gospel. This is intended to proclaim Christ *to* them and bring them *to* Him, but, besides this, they must be implanted *into* Him. This cannot be effected by any mere instruction or illumination. If we are to be raised from death to life, it must be by some transaction on the part of God, by which we, who are *really dead* in trespasses and sins, may be just as *really quickened*. Eph. ii. 1.

This is well illustrated in the history of Nicodemus. He was a “master in Israel,” and came to Jesus by night, and said, “Rabbi, we know that thou art a *teacher* come from God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him.” How promptly our Saviour turns his thoughts away from *teaching*, as something entirely insufficient, to a new *life* as the essential thing: “Verily, verily I say unto thee, except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.” How essentially He makes the life to be the light of men! And whatever was the confusion in the mind of this learned man,—however he was disposed to ask “How can these things be?” our Saviour still insists upon the fact to which He at the first, attached His double Amen:—that a man must be *born of the water and the Spirit* in order even to enter the kingdom of God. (John iii).

The life then comes before the light. The life is to become the light of men, and not the light the life of men. To be in Christ is the first thing, and then the light will come. “Then shall we know if we follow on to know the Lord. His going

forth, is prepared as the morning."* "I am the light of the world," says Jesus. "He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the *light of life*."[†] "I am come a light into the world, that whosoever believeth on me should not abide in darkness."[‡] "If any man do His will, he shall know the doctrine whether it be of God."[§] "The path of the just is as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day."^{||}

And is not God wisest and best after all? Is it not a gracious provision that the life of God, lost to us in the first Adam, is brought back to us in the second Generic Head of our race? Could we find any comfort or have any salvation in view of the awful *fact* of sin and death that has blighted our humanity, if the life and grace given to us in the God-man were any less a reality? And is not the very *order* of God's grace the best? Is it not a glorious thing for our dear little children, that the life is to be the light of men; and that this life may be made over to them by a sacramental transaction before their undeveloped minds can even try to grasp it? Any scheme that makes the light to be the life of men, excludes them at least, whatever else may be said of it? Thank God for their sake, that the life ante-dates the light; that in the sphere of grace as well as in the sphere of nature, the life underlies and precedes all consciousness and all knowledge; and that the life thus given them may be nourished by the milk of the word, and then fed by that bread which nourishes to life eternal.

The whole scheme of the Heidelberg Catechism is built on this order. *First* it asks, "What is thy only comfort in life and death?" and *afterward*, "How many things are necessary for thee to know, that thou, enjoying this comfort, mayest live and die happy?" This order was in Paul's mind too, when he said he counted all things but loss, that he might apprehend that for which he was apprehended of Christ Jesus; (Phil. iii.

* Hosea vi. 3. † John viii. 12. ‡ John xii. 46. § John viii. 17. || Prov. iv. 18.

12) as if Christ's mysterious power had *first laid hold of him*, with a purpose of his salvation, and now he was striving to come to a full *realization* of that salvation. This is the order that makes *grace* prominent. First the love of God *constituting us children*, by making the life that was in His Son over to us by the Holy Ghost, and then our recognition of Him as "Our Father who art in Heaven." First the life and then the light; and that life, not the mere ordering of our outward conduct,* but the vital principle of God's own being mediated to man through His own dear Son:—that life, not a mere intellectual scheme to be held up before the mind for study, but the real life of Christ brought into us by a regenerating act that makes us sons of God, and without which, all our prayers to Him as "Our Father" are appeals to a relation that does not exist; that life, without which all claims to "sonship" and consequent "heirship" are false.

To Christ, then, who "*is our Life*," the Scriptures point us. "They are they which testify of me," says Christ, who had a higher regard for them than the Jews whom he rebuked. This is their chief value, according to their own prominent declarations. They are called, "*The book of the Revelation of Jesus Christ.*"† Nay more, "*The book of the GENERATION of Jesus Christ,*"‡ that is, the book of the conception and birth of Him, who in our human nature, put forth His Divine power for our redemption; and as the life which He brought into the world becomes our life, they are the book of the *re-generation* of man. "He that believeth on the *Son of God* hath the witness in himself; he that believeth not God hath made Him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of His Son. And *this is the record*, that God hath given to us *eternal life*, and *this life is in His Son*. He that *hath the Son, hath life*, and he that *hath not the Son hath not life*,"§ his biblical knowledge and theological acquirements to the contrary notwithstanding.

* As when Paul speaks of the *manner* of his life, from his youth. *Acts xxvi. 4.*

† *Rev. i. 1.* ‡ *Matt. i. 1.* § *1 John, v. 10—12.*

*"This is life eternal, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent."**

He is the One "In whom" that is, in the CONSTITUTION OF WHOSE PERSON "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,"† and "ye are *in Christ Jesus*, who of God, is made *unto us* wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification and redemption."‡

ART. II.—SKETCH OF THE HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

From the Accession of Henry VIII. to the End of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth.‡

BY REV. J. W. SANTEE.

IN the XVIth Century, history records the commencement, progress and result of a revolution, on the Continent of Europe, as well as in the sea-girt isle, which came down to us, styled a Reformation on a broad scale, by which we have introduced a new order of government for the Church, a reform in doctrine, and which claims to have set free the human mind, before fettered and bound by priestcraft and popery. The results, brought about in a short time, were truly wonderful, which in Germany, Holland, England and Scotland, changed the relation in which, prior to this, the State stood to the Church, and the Church, in these countries, stood to the Pontiff at Rome. Whatever may have been the corruptions found in the Roman Catholic Church—whatever may have been the relations in which the Princes and Emperors stood to the See of Rome, one thing is certain, that in a very short period of time, we have a complete overthrow of the old order, which held for nearly sixteen centuries, and the introduction of something new.

* John xvii. 3.

† Col. ii. 3.

‡ 1 Cor. i. 30.

‡ Sources. Dr. Schaff's Lect. on Ch. Hist. Hallam's Const. Hist. of England. Agnes Strickland, Lives of the Queens of England, &c., &c.

In order to effect such a radical change in the order, as it stood prior to this upheaval, it will be necessary to understand the springs and forces, lying far back in former history, which were quietly, yet powerfully, at work, that we may trace their progress in preparing the way, which in so short a space of time brought to pass such results. The English Reformation always claimed and still lays stress, on what was supposed to be fact, that here a history is presented which preserves a clear and unbroken succession from Apostolic days ; and as the charge is made, once and again, that, in proportion, as we, in the German Reformed Church become churchly, and plant ourselves on true and solid Protestant ground, in opposition to the insecure and dangerous position of the larger portion of our common Protestantism, we must become Episcopal, or in other words, must lose ourselves in that branch of the Church, let us endeavor to institute an inquiry into the history of this Reformation and try to have a clear coast and a fair sea for sailing.

EARLY HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

It is not to be conceived, that such a revolution as that described by historians, could be effected, without a preparation of years beforehand, so as to reach such results. Our Christianity, to be worthy of any consideration, must be historical, and not dug out fresh from the Bible by some ingenious inventor. It must come down in the long line of the Ages, from its Holy Founder, and we cannot conceive of it as springing, *de novo*, from the brain of any one, in any land or country, after the fashion of our miserable sects.* Accordingly, we find Christianity introduced into Britain in very early times, indeed by some, it is claimed that the Blessed Gospel was brought

* A very curious passage occurs in a paragraph taken from the address of Luther against the Iconoclasts as follows: "You ought to know that you are to listen to no one but to me. With the help of God, Doctor Martin Luther has advanced first in the new way; the others followed after him: they ought to exhibit the docility of disciples, as their duty is to obey. *It is to me that God has revealed His Word: it is out of my mouth that it has proceeded free from all stain.*" This is singularly strange.

thither by some one of the College of Apostles.* This claim, however, rests upon a foundation so slender that there is much "to oppose," and cannot be historically maintained, and is now generally given up. From history, it seems that there were two epochs in the introduction of Christianity into Britain, linking themselves, in an historical way, to the past, and so to Apostolic times. It is more than probable, that nothing was known of Christianity in the island before the years 176 or 180 after Christ, and that it was brought thither under the direction and advice of Eleutherius, at the request of Lucius, a British king.† British writers tell us, that late in the second century, two missionaries, Fugatius and Damian, were sent with commissions from Eleutherius to England, and through their ministrations great numbers of the people were converted to the faith, and that by them the foundation of Christianity was laid in England. Another epoch of greater importance, in bringing positive Christianity into England, as Dr. Schaff tells us in his Lectures on Church-History, we have near the close of the 6th century. Augustine, with a band of forty assistants, landed in England, having been sent thither by Pope Gregory, and by whose labors, Ethelbert, the king of Kent, embraced Christianity. His example was imitated by many of his subjects, and subsequently these devoted men, extended their labors successfully over the whole island. During this period and by the labors of these men, the important Sees of Canterbury, York and London were founded, and brought into direct relation to the Chair of St. Peter; that the English or Anglican Church connects itself with early Christianity, and Apostolic times, and has this succession through the influence of Rome, or the Chair of St. Peter. Thus far, there are two epochs in the introduction of Christianity into England, the British and the

* "Now against this mass of testimony, to show that the Apostles (one of whom in this expedition, was certainly Paul, the tent-maker) established Christianity in Britain, there is nothing whatever to oppose." Ministerial Commission. By Rev. Lloyd Windsor, A. M., p. 135.

† Speaking of the petition made by the king to Eleutherius, Bede says, "Obserans, ut per ejus mandatum Christianus efficeretur: et mox effectum p*ro*p*ri*a*m* postulationis consecutus est."

Anglo-Saxon, but both proceeded from the established order as found in these regularly constituted bishops. The "Succession" from the start, is not difficult to be made out, for the regular line is clear and easily traced, but the task becomes far more difficult when attempted through the period in which the upheaval really took place.

It may not be uninteresting to understand in what relation these British churches, founded by the authority of Eleutherius, and those by Augustine, under Pope Gregory, stood to the Pontiff at Rome. The establishment of these different sees, especially Canterbury, offered a great centre of authority and power to the Church. It is asserted by D'Aubigne in his History of the English Reformation, that these British churches were subjected by force, to the See of Canterbury, and so to the Pope at Rome, by the agency of Augustine and his colleagues or their successors, but this statement is incorrect, as the history shows.* Efforts, however, were made to bring these British churches, after an existence of nearly 400 years, to acknowledge the authority of the Roman Pontiff and to enter the pale of Catholic Unity, but all without any effect: Augustine died in 605, and it was eight years after the death of this man of God, that the war, which proved so disastrous to these churches, took place, of which D'Aubigne speaks. Eight years after the death of Augustine, in 613, the pagan king of Northumbria, named Edelfrid, "stimulated by vengeance against the Britons, for having given shelter to the heir of a rival claimant of his crown," besides his hatred of them, invaded their country, and in a great battle at Chester, conquered them, and while this was transpiring he discovered that the monks of Bangor were praying for the success of the British; that then, he caused his troops to fall upon them, which they did, and massacred them by hundreds.† Dr. Schaff tells us,

* The History of D'Aubigne of this movement in England, as well as his history of the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland, is so one-sided, as to be unreliable and wholly unsatisfactory.

† Bede says: "Ipsa Augustino jam multo ante tempore ad ecclesiastia regna sublatto."

that among the Britons, Christianity was never vigorous—that anarchy reigned among them, which corresponds with what historians tell us, as Gildas, a countryman of the Britons, “that the British clergy were exceedingly profligate in their morals, and many of them were addicted to morals which were a disgrace to the priestly character. They openly bought or sacrilegiously seized upon the dignities of the Church. They were ignorant and indolent, and in general all ecclesiastical discipline was greatly relaxed among them.” The ecclesiastical order, as we have it in Augustine and his men, was more vigorous and of a far higher character than that of the Britons, and in whatever they may have been wanting, their morals and discipline were superior. It need not be wondered at, that efforts were made to extend this authority and the influence of the Roman Pontiff, and that, in the nature of the case, the weaker had to yield to the stronger. Error and systems mixed with it, can never stand against the true light, neither could these British churches, governed as they were, stand against the vigorous life and power of that form which stood in such close connection with the See of Rome. Attempts were made to bring them into subjection and thus under proper authority, in a Conference held with them on the borders of Wales, and the demands made, were reduced to three points: “that they should observe the orthodox computation of Easter: that they should conform to the Roman rite in the administration of Baptism, and join with Augustine and his colleagues, in preaching the Gospel to the Saxons.” These demands were refused, and like heresies of old gradually disappeared, so did these British clergy disappear, unwilling, as they were, to be reformed and brought under proper authority. This then leaves an open sea, and from henceforth, we have authority as exercised from the See of Canterbury, which stood under the control of Rome, and extended itself over the whole island.* As the Anglo-Saxon Church was now established, her interests were specially

* That the Church of Rome, did, at an early period try to extend its power where it could, is beyond all doubt; that it did in after times obtain a spiritual supremacy in England, is equally unquestionable.—Bishop Short.

guarded by the Pope at Rome, and princes and people, clergy and bishops acknowledged this authority. This was not a pretended authority, but an authority that was exercised, and this claim and the exercise of it, reaches through the long period from near the close of the 6th, to the Norman Conquest, the middle of the 11th century. In order to place this point beyond controversy, it is asserted, and has not been disproved, "that during these intervening ages, no less than eight Saxon kings made a pilgrimage to Rome to receive the benediction of the Pope, while others sent their ambassadors to the Chair of St. Peter, and on the other hand, legates were sent from Rome to England, to settle difficulties, and regulate discipline." As evidence of this, we have the case of Wilfrid, bishop of York, when deposed unjustly by Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, appealing to Rome.* Though deprived of his see, for some time, by the instigation of the king and his enemies, the fact is clear that he looked to Rome for redress, and that the voice of the Pope was heard by the Church with respectful obedience. Another example, somewhat similar, we have in the case of St. Dunstan, archbishop of Canterbury, in which case the authority of Rome was heard in its settlement. There cannot be the shadow of doubt, that Bishop Short is correct, "that Rome obtained spiritual supremacy over the land," but now, dangers of another order, were arising, and became more formidable with time, and which continued to increase, until the rupture with Rome actually took place.

So far England had been governed by numerous monarchs, who, at times, as it pleased them, took liberties with the sacred rights of the Church. About the middle of the 11th century we have a change of this whole former order, by William, the Norman, who effected the conquest of England. Power before was divided among the different rulers, now it became centralized, and was made to rest in the sole person of the monarch.

* "St. Wilfrid was deposed at the instance of Egfrid, king of Northumberland, who was instigated thereto by his unprincipled wife, Ermenburga, whom Wilfrid had grievously offended by endeavoring to curb her vices, and to put an end to her grievous scandals."

A strange contest now commenced. Kings, who have no scruples of conscience, have little regard for the sacred rights of the Church. This fact now comes clearly out. William, it is said, wielded his sceptre with an iron arm, and as his successors did, he attempted to interfere with spiritual matters, and to bring into bondage the clergy of the Church. It is truly wonderful, how seed, sown long ages back, will lie inactive, until conditions are suited to call it into life. Already, under the Saxon kings, attempts were made to encroach on the sacred rights of the Church, which were now renewed with more vigor and force, and which led at last to the rupture itself. This spirit of encroachment underlies the history, indeed, from the very start on to the time of Henry VIII, and it is necessary to understand it, in making up the account of this wonderful movement.

The principles which were insisted on, in the ages preceding the Norman dynasties, we have clearly and fully stated by Lingard, in his *Antiquities*. “By Theodore, the discipline of the Saxon Church was reduced to a more perfect form. The choice of bishops was secured to the national Synods, in which the primate presided and regulated the process of election. Gradually it devolved to the clergy of each church, whose choice was corroborated by the presence and acclamations of the more respectable of the laity. But the notions of the feudal jurisprudence incessantly undermined the freedom of these elections. As it was dangerous to intrust the Episcopal power to the hands of the enemy, the king forbade the consecration of the bishop elect, till the royal consent had been obtained; and as the revenues of the church were originally the donation of the crown, he claimed the right of investing the new prelate with the temporalities of his bishopric. As soon as any church became vacant, the ring and crozier, the emblems of Episcopal jurisdiction, were carried to the king by a deputation of the chapter, and returned by him to the person whom they had chosen, with a letter by which the civil officers were ordered to maintain him in the possession of the lands belonging to his church. The claims of the crown were progressive. By de-

grees the royal will was notified to the clergy of the vacant bishopric, under the modest veil of a recommendation in favor of a particular candidate, at last, the rights of the chapter were openly invaded; and before the fall of the Anglo-Saxon dynasty, we meet with instances of bishops appointed by the Sovereign, without waiting for the choice, or soliciting the consent of the clergy." Lingard's *Antiquities*, p. 47.

This extract gives us a flood of light, and the after history clearly teaches, that, interfering with the privileges and liberties of the Church, the Norman and Saxon kings were slow to relinquish the privilege, and we find the same state of things in the time of Henry VIII, under the reign of Queen Elizabeth, down even to our day, where we have the subjection of the Church to the State or the Crown, so that understanding it clearly, we have the key whereby to explain the success which attended the efforts and brought to pass the rupture, though sternly and earnestly resisted by the established authority as we have it in the Roman See. We do not believe in the theory, at times advocated, that the State is superior to the Church, but, that the Church is the Kingdom "which is to endure forever." We have this principle underlying the contests in the middle ages, which were carried on between the Emperors and the Popes, and there is no doubt, that it was to the well-being of society, and the advantage of the cause of truth, and of the Church, that there was no flinching on the part of the Popes, and that, generally the State had to yield. Not so, however, in these contests in Britain. What the result has been in the way of consequence, is now open to the world. It needs no eye with gifted power to see, that vast injury would accrue to the Church by allowing the secular power to interfere and dictate as to her rights. The chief form of encroachment came from the election of Bishops. Unworthy men, from impure, selfish motives, often gained the ear of the king and obtained appointments, to the injury of the Church and the cause of true Christianity. The misery of these wicked schemes came to the surface gradually, and hastened on towards fruit.

After the accession of William, the Church was ably cared

for by the stern and determined Lanfranc, then Archbishop of Canterbury, an Italian by birth, a most learned, pious and prudent man. It seems that he had nerve sufficient to insist on the rights belonging to the Church, and could not be influenced by the court, neither would he take counsel of flesh and blood. Overawed as the King was, by this man of God, William proved to be a friend and protector to Lanfranc in his struggles with the Norman barons. Unflinching, in his character, “he succeeded in rooting out abuses, restoring discipline, advanced the cause of learning, overawed disaffection and checked the rapacity of the hungry adventurers, who had come over in the train of the Conqueror.” He stood in the closest relations to the Chair of St. Peter, and acted under Papal authority. During this time, Oderic tells us : “that he refrained from seizing on the revenues of vacant bishoprics and abbeys, protected them from the rapacity of his barons, and named a successor with the advice of the principal clergy.” As time passed on and opportunity offered, the real spirit of the King showed itself in this form. “He would not permit the authority of any particular Pontiff to be acknowledged in his dominions without his previous approbation : and he directed that all letters issued from the court of Rome, should, on their arrival, be submitted to the royal inspection ; and so jealous was he of any encroachment on his authority, that without the royal license he would not permit the decisions of the national or provincial councils to be carried into effect ; he forbade the regular ecclesiastical courts to implead or excommunicate any individual holding in chief of the crown until the nature of the offence had been certified to himself.” This is an advance—progress. The nature of the contest becomes more clear, and the danger threatening the Church becomes more apparent. With these foundations firmly laid, William died, and was succeeded, as Emperor, by his son Rufus, or William II, in whose reign, that which before had been hidden, now came to light in various enactments, in which the crown encroached boldly on the rights of the Church. It is said, as a ruler, he was licentious, extravagant and reckless. As long as God spared to the Church, the bold and energetic pri-

mate Lanfranc, who administered the See of Canterbury, the King observed some regard for the rights of the Church, but two years after his accession, in 1089, the venerable Archbishop fell asleep, free rein was assumed by the King, and he openly trampled law and order under foot, and made bold advances in trenching on ecclesiastical rights. Licentious, as he was, he scrupled not to seize on the revenues of the Church and vacant benefices to supply himself with money "for his own selfish gratification and for squandering among his guilty favorites." In order to make the most out of them, he unscrupulously kept bishoprics and abbeys vacant for years, little caring what injury would result to the Church and her members. As the See of Canterbury was an important one, and its revenues large, he kept it vacant for four long years, when Providence interfered by prostrating him on a bed of sickness which brought him nigh unto death, and becoming alarmed, he relented and gave his consent to the appointment of the sainted monk Anselm to the vacant See. These holy men, always zealous for the rights of the Church, contended to the last, and after much entreaty Anselm accepted the arduous duties of the See, only on condition, that the King would give back the property of the Church, unlawfully seized, and acknowledge Urban II, as the lawful Pontiff. While upon his sick bed, confronted with death, the King readily acceded. As if to put his sincerity to the test, the crisis of his disease was passed over and the King was restored, but then, as now, sick persons make promises readily and willingly which, when well, they are unwilling to fulfil. So it was with the King. Having passed the crisis, and restored to health, the King became more rapacious than before, and unscrupulously seized on the revenues of the Church, and in order to gratify his wicked spirit, he kept these sacred offices vacant during his pleasure. But there was no compromise with these holy men. Anselm stood firm and unyielding. The King on the other side was obstinate, and in every way attempted to get the incumbent of the See out of the way, by having him deposed, but this man of God remained firm. To show how unscrupulous the King was, and what endeavors were made to carry his point, the Pri-

mate being supported by the barons, who defended him, the King wrote to the Pope, acknowledging him as Pontiff, and promising him a rich pension if he would consent to depose Anselm. But his point was not easily gained, for the Pope, true to his office, indignantly spurned the bribe, and was unwilling to be instrumental in punishing a man who was innocent, and who battled for the rights of the Church. Anselm saw, that with such an unscrupulous enemy the contest would be against the Church. He then, in 1097 left the Kingdom, and came to the feet of the Pope, and there offered the following reasons: "The King would not restore to my Church those lands belonging to it which he had given away after the death of Lanfranc; he even continued to give more away, notwithstanding my opposition; he required of me grievous services, which had never been required of my predecessor: he annulled the law of God and the canonical and apostolical decisions, by customs of his own creation. In such conduct I could not acquiesce, without the loss of my own soul: to plead against him in his own court was vain; for no one dared to assist or advise me. This then is my object in coming to you, to beg that you would free me from the bondage of the episcopal dignity, and allow me to serve God again in the tranquillity of my cell; and that in the next place, you would provide for the Churches of the English, according to your wisdom and the authority of your station." We cannot follow in detail the history of these men. We merely wish to trace this growing spirit, and to show how earnestly the Church resisted it. The successor of William II, followed in the same track of his predecessors, reviving these claims to the bishoprics and abbeys, and after a contest long and faithfully carried on, Anselm, the man of God, fell asleep and went to his reward, in 1109. A history somewhat similar, we have in the stern and unflinching Thomas à Becket, made Archbishop of Canterbury in 1162, and who, because, he boldly resisted King Henry II, in his encroachments, was obliged to fly the Kingdom when he betook himself to the Pontiff at Rome; by whom arrangements were made for the return of the exiled primate, which he did, but only to become, shortly after, a martyr, "as-

sassinated, as he was at the foot of his own Cathedral altar by courtly assassins." A history somewhat akin to this we have in that of Edmund Rich. What a contest, and with what vigor carried on, in defence of rights, sacred to the cause of Christ. Venerable men and worthy of all honor, for their noble fight against the crown, and defending the rights of the Church. In what contrast, does not this noble, martyr spirit stand, when confronted with the cowardly spirit shown by the ministry during our late rebellion, when the ordained minister, by the authority of the government, was dragged from his office, thus overriding the Church, and thrust unceremoniously into the rank and file of the army. A dark spot this, on our *Christian* spirit, as a people. By those men, in these former days, the rights of the Church meant something with which neither the crown, nor any other secular power had any right to interfere. This right, the Church never yielded. She claims it to this day.

Such was the spirit, and after this fashion things continued, until near the middle of the 14th century, when a series of enactments were passed by the English Parliament, between 1343 and 1393, under Edward III, and Richard II, entitled "Statutes of Provision or *Præmunire*." The king was jealous of the authority of the Pope, and hence the acts of 1343, and afterward under Edward III, "forbade, under penalty of forfeiture, and subsequently of outlawry, the bringing into the kingdom of such letters of provision for vacant benefices, or of documents of any other description which should be deemed contrary to the rights of the monarch and of the realm; and provided that the election to vacant sees and abbeys should be nominally free, but that the king should have the bestowal of the vacant benefice whenever the Pope interfered, and the lay patron neglected to select the incumbent." Matters were converging to a focus, and in 1393 the famous statute of *Præmunire* was drawn up in Parliament and left to be carried out at the discretion of the king, with the advice of his council. By this statute "it was provided, that if any man pursue or obtain in the Court of Rome, or elsewhere, such translations, excommunications, bulls, instruments or other things against the king's

crown and regality or kingdom as aforesaid, or bring them into the realm, or execute them either within the realm or without, such person or persons, their notaries, procurators, fautors or counsellors shall be out of the king's protection, their goods and chattels, lands and tenements shall be forfeited to the king, and their persons attached wherever they may be found." In all these controversies, and in these encroachments, it almost invariably turned out, that the advantage remained with the king and weakened the powers of the Pontiff, and deprived the clergy of that dignity and honor, which they had a right to claim, as "stewards of the mysteries of God." Before, the Church suffered somewhat, now she suffered more. Elections to vacant offices often amounted to nothing; worldly-minded men succeeded to gain possession of them, and thus were wholly dependent on the caprices of the king; who, for one moment, would hesitate to decide between appointments thus made and those made by the Pope. Such men as Anselm, à Becket, Rich and others are not to be brought into comparison with men filling these sees and abbeys, who were ever ready to do the bidding of unprincipled kings.* That these men discharged their solemn trusts, as became bishops and stewards, is witnessed to, by writers, both Roman Catholic and Protestant. Mr. Foss, speaking of Lanfranc, says, "He was not only willingly accepted by the monks and approved by the barons and people, but gladly confirmed by the Pope. * * On his return from Rome, he devoted himself strenuously to the duties of his office, and labored successfully in reforming the irregularities and rudeness of his clergy. His severity in depriving many, occasioned considerable complaints, but the introduction of foreign scholars in their places contributed effectually to the enlightenment of the nation." Of Simon, of Sudbury, Archbishop of Canterbury, murdered by an English mob under Richard II, Mr. Foss says: "The character of the

* It is said of the clergy in Germany, and the same is applicable to the clergy in England, thus: "It cannot be denied that, whatever the national writers may say to the contrary, the ecclesiastics appointed by the Pope were generally far superior, as regards both merit and conduct, to those nominated by the chapter or bishops." Hist. Germanic Empire, Vol. 2, Ch. 3.

archbishop, as represented by the historians, was such, as to make him least liable to popular hatred. He was a liberal, free and generous spirit; admired for his wonderful parts, for his wisdom, his learning and his eloquence, and revered for the piety of his life, the charity he dispensed, and the merciful consideration he always exhibited."

How this spirit progressed, and gradually prepared the way and cast off the authority of Rome, we have in Acts, as early as 1315. "At that time came into England two legates. As the manner of the Romans is, they ride with great solemnity into the north country, for to make Lodewick Beaumont, bishop of Durham, against the election of the monks who had chosen another. And, though they were warned that they should not come there, yet they rode till they came to Darlington. And sodeynly out of a vail rose a great people—Capteyns Gilbert de Middleton and Walter Selby. They laid hands on them, and robbed them of all their treasure; and Lodewick, whom they intended to make bishop, they led to a town called Morpath, and compelled him to make a grete ransom. Then came the cardinal to London, and asks of the clergy eight pence in the mark, by way of compensation for their loss. They were answered with a sneer, "that they gave them no counsel for to go so far north." How completely all power centered in the crown, and what pernicious fruit it began to bear, we have in examples like the following : "In the reign of Edward I, the King demanded *one-half* the annual revenue of the clergy. A Knight rose up in the midst of the convocation, and said : 'My venerable men, this is the demand of the King, the moiety of the annual revenue of your Churches. And if any one objects to this let him rise up in the middle of the assembly, that his person may be recognized and taken note of, as he is guilty of treason against the King's peace.' When they heard this, all the prelates were disturbed, and immediately agreed to the King's demands." And well might they. By degrees the power of the Roman See was so much weakened, that the authority of the Pope was only nominal, and could not be of any practical benefit in selecting good men for vacant bishoprics and

exercising and enforcing proper discipline. This spirit came to its head in the reign of Henry VIII, gathering such force through centuries past, that a writer already quoted remarks : " As we advance towards the Reformation, we see the spirit of slavery stealing over men's minds, taking its origin from a servile worship of the *visible*, embodied in an earthly sovereignty. The old English vigor of intellect and character was becoming palsied beneath the heavy chilling pressure of regal tyranny, and losing all its elastic energy and racy heartiness. In truth, these chronicles, taken altogether, throw a clear, strong light upon our English history ; and the more that light is diffused, the more apparent will it be, that all the abuses of the Church, in that age, arose from servility to royalty ; and from the virtual subjection of the episcopate, and that spirit of the world, which was afterwards formally embodied and enthroned and still is so, in the royal supremacy ; in other words, all these mediæval chronicles are witnesses for the Papacy."

From these statements, it is clear that English Christianity came through the authority of Rome, and connects itself by regular succession through Rome to the early Church and apostolic times. Moreover, it is no less clear, that the difficulties in the English Church, for ten centuries, were caused by an unlawful interference of the temporal with the spiritual, and that in these contests, the Pontiffs were clearly in the right, and were battling for the rights of the Church, as well as the freedom and spiritual liberty of the individual, while the Kings, generally, were selfish, actuated by impure motives, anxious to rob the Church of her rights—degrade the ministry to a secular office, and secularize her property and devote it to unholy and unlawful purposes. What untold miseries resulted from this secularization in England and in Germany, let *impartial* history determine. The seed sown in the ages past, nurtured and fostered, as it was, by the secular spirit, was now ready to bloom and yield fruit under the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Queen Elizabeth.

ACCESSION OF HENRY VIII.

It is now easy to see, with such preparation, that little was wanting to draw the lines so clearly and distinctly, as to shut out the Roman power, full of tyranny, as was supposed, and concentrate all power in the person of the King or Queen, far more arbitrary and tyrannical. It cannot be disputed, with any sort of truth, that this power would have been safer, exercised by the Roman See, than to be vested in the hands of unscrupulous and selfish Kings and Queens. How ends are shaped, and what results are made to hang on acts—this shall all appear in the brief sketch of this history, how the Reformation really was commenced, carried on, and actually consummated.

Henry VIII, ascended the throne of England in 1509. In his reign the rupture with Rome formally took place. We have seen the condition of the church and her relation to the Kings who successively ruled. Now, who was Henry VIII, and what part did he perform in this wonderful movement? As to the character of this King, it is too late in the day to attempt from history, intelligibly understood, a defense of his character, as recently by Froude in his History of England; we shall read it as portrayed by impartial historians, whether the picture will be pleasant or not. During his reign we find the position of the church, as formerly held, wholly changed, whether for better or worse, and spiritual power vested in the King instead of the Pontiff. Says Bishop Short: "The chief mover of the Reformation in this country was a King brought up with a high respect and admiration for those doctrines which were combated by the Reformers, who had publicly embarked in their defense, and acquired the title of Defender of the Faith," &c., . . .

. . . "the existence of the church of England as a distinct body, and her final separation from Rome, may be dated from the period of the divorce." We have the same in the Book of Homilies. "Honor be to God, who did put light in the heart of *his true and faithful minister*, of most famous memory, King Henry the Eighth, and give him the knowledge of His word, and an earnest affection to seek His glory, and to put away all such superstitious and pharisaical sects, by antichrist invented, and

set up against the true word of God, and glory of His most blessed name, as He gave the like spirit to the most noble and famous princes Josaphat, Josias, and Ezechias." How earnest he was for the "knowledge of God and His word," and "affection to seek His glory," we shall see in the sequel.

Henry VIII, had every preparation for a splendid reign. Of a fine appearance, an education more than ordinary, he had before him a brilliant future. He was married to Catharine of Arragon, it is said, "a virtuous woman of noble lineage and lofty bearing." Related, as she was, to Charles V, his Kingdom was brought into close alliance with that of Spain, one of the most powerful and wealthiest Kingdoms of Europe. Not only was he qualified for the affairs of government, but when Luther had attacked the Papal Church, Henry VIII eagerly took up his pen and wielded it in defense of the Pope, against Luther, and having laid his first offering of this kind at the feet of the Pope, he obtained from him the title *Fidei Defensor*. For eighteen long years he lived peaceably and happily with his lawful wife Catharine, against whose character neither friend nor foe dared say aught. But all at once, after this time had elapsed, suddenly, the conscience of the King became alarmed, discovering, as he thought he had, that he had been living unlawfully with Catharine.* It seems, however, that he had been captivated by one of the Queen's maids of honor, Anne Boleyn, possessing qualities of person which she knew too well how to manage, to decoy the King and supplant his lawful wife. The question was, how to get rid of Catharine. To do it, two ways were open before him; either to kill her or divorce her. Sunk

* "Whether Henry really felt any scruple respecting the validity of his marriage during the first eighteen years of his reign, may be reasonably doubted. No trace of such doubts can be discovered in his public conduct, till the year 1527. Catharine had then passed the middle age; personal infirmities are mentioned, which might have widened the alienation. About the same time Anne Boleyn, a damsel of the court, at the age of twenty-two, in the flower of youthful beauty, and full of graces and accomplishments, touched the fierce, but not unsusceptible heart of the King.

The light which shone from Anne Boleyn's eyes might have awakened or revived Henry's doubts of the legitimacy of his long union with the faithful and blameless Catharine. His licentious passions, by a singular operation, recalled his mind to his theological studies."—Sir James Mackintosh's *His. of England*, p. 222.

as he was, he recoiled from murdering her; a crime in which he became an expert, and he bent the energies of his mind to accomplish his purpose, by divorcing her. It is said, that before Wolsey and the clergy he plead scruples of conscience; to his Parliament, he alleged reasons of state policy and the dangers to the realm of a disputed succession. The real secret, no doubt, is given by Agnes Strickland: "Meantime a treatise on the unlawfulness of his present marriage was compounded by the King and some of his favorite divines. How painfully and laboriously the royal theologian toiled in this literary labyrinth, is evinced in a letter written by himself to the fair lady *whose bright eyes had afflicted him with such unwonted qualms of conscience* that he had been fain to add the pains and penalties of authorship to the cares of government for her sake." (*Lives of the Queens of England*, vol. iv. p. 142). About this time, one of those mysterious Providences visited the Kingdom, which confronted King and subject in such a way that there was no escape, in what is known as the "sweating sickness," during the prevalence of which, it seems, that he became conscience-smitten, his knees smiting together; when he quickly dismissed his mistress and recalled his lawful wife, with whom he united in all her daily devotions, went to confession, received the Holy Communion every week, and became reconciled to his friends.* His sincerity was soon put to the test when the danger had passed by, for he dismissed his lawful wife, and recalled his mistress Anne. The vital question was the divorce. The Universities were consulted in reference to the case; bribes were offered and received; trickery resorted to; yet withal, the answers, generally, were unfavorable to the King, because of the solemn denial by Catharine of the charges made against her. Whatever could be done with the Universities, and other emi-

* "If Anne was not actually his mistress at the time of the 'sweating sickness,' in 1528, she seems to have become such not long afterwards, at least during the three years previous to her marriage with the King. The marriage was hastened by the fact of her being suddenly found in a condition to give him an heir, the legitimacy of whose birth it was deemed of importance to place beyond doubt or cavil.

Elizabeth was born a little over seven months after the date of the marriage."

nent persons, at Rome, on the Chair of St. Peter was seated Clement VII, whom nothing could influence. Though he had received from a former Pope the honorable title of *Fidei Defensor*, and was called his "dear son Henry," the Pope would not consent to the divorce nor allow him to have more than one wife, according to the law of God.* What a contrast with the Reformers on the Continent, in reference to the bigamy of the Landgrave of Hesse, sanctioning two wives, which we have in a document of twenty-four sections, ably drawn up, and signed by Martin Luther, Philip Melanthon, Martin Bucer, Antony Corvin, Adam, John Lenninger, Justus Wintferte, and Denis Melanther.†

Tytler gives us a graphic description of the last sitting of the Court for trying the divorce. "On the 23d of July, the legitimate Court met for the last time, and as it was generally expected by those ignorant of the intrigues at Rome that a decision would be pronounced for the King, the hall was crowded. Henry himself was present, but concealed behind the hangings, where he could hear all that passed. When the cardinals had taken their seats, his majesty's counsel demanded judgment; upon which Campeggio replied, that the case was too high and notable to be determined before he should have made the Pope acquainted with all the proceedings. 'I have not,' said he, 'come so far to please any man for fear, need or favor, be he King or any other potentate. I am an old man, sick, decayed, and looking daily for death. What should it then avail me to put my soul in danger of God's displeasure, to my utter damnation, for the favor of any prince or high estate in this world. For as much, then,

* "To all their remonstrances (of Henry's ambassadors) he (Pope Clement VII,) returned the same answer; that he could not refuse to Catharine, what the ordinary forms of justice required; that he was devoted to the King, and eager to gratify him in any manner conformable with law and equity; but that they ought not to require from him what was evidently unjust, or they would find that when his conscience was concerned, he was equally insensible to considerations of interest or of danger."

† "Anne, however, had her anxieties at this crisis, for the opinion of all Christendom was so much against the divorce that Henry was disposed to waver. Luther himself declared, 'that he would rather allow the King to take two wives than dissolve the present marriage.'" *Queens of England*, vol. iv. p. 163. She quotes Luther's *Epist. Hulse*, 177, p. 290.

that I understand the truth in this case, is very difficult to be known, and that the defendant will make no answer thereunto, but has appealed from our judgment; therefore, to avoid all injustice and obscure doubts, I intend to proceed no further in this matter, until I have the opinion of the Pope, and such others of his council as have more experience and learning. For this purpose,' he concluded, rising from his chair, 'I adjourn the cause till the commencement of the next term, in the beginning of October.' There was now a doubt as to the course of the King, and Anne, fearful that he would relent, unprincipled as she was, did everything in her power to urge on the King to divorce his wife. To accomplish her end, she found a willing ally in Thomas Cromwell, the son of a fuller, who was raised, by Wolsey, from obscurity, and who succeeded in supplanting his benefactor. By the efforts of this man and his cunning intrigue, he succeeded in carrying the point and obtaining the divorce, and Anne became Queen of England, and Cromwell obtained power seldom reached by few. D'Aubigne speaks of two divorces, divorcing Catharine, his lawful wife, contrary to the voice of Christendom, which led to the rupture or brought to pass the second divorce, divorcing England from the centre of Catholic unity. Now all restraints were cast off. He was rid of the Pope, that thorn in his side,—of his legates, and an opportunity was offered to him to seize on the possessions of the church, thus ridding the people of a spiritual despot, in the person of the Pope, only to make room for a tyrant in church and state, who knew no bounds, and who was rapacious and unprincipled.* Now the ice was broken. Anne rejoiced in her success, but in the short space of four months, after the death of the divorced Catharine, Anne herself was divorced, and brought to the block as an adulteress and guilty of high treason. What an avenging of history. This was accomplished by Cranmer, whom Henry had made Archbishop

* Cardinal Pole, in his apology addressed to Charles V., mentions this act of unheard of cruelty—of Henry refusing to be softened either by the entreaties of Catharine or the tears of Mary into granting one final interview between mother and daughter. "Cum hoc idem filia cum lacrymis postularet, mater vix extremum spiritum vitae ducens flagitaret, quod hostis nisi crudelissimus nunquam negasset, conjux a viro, mater pro filia, impetrare non potuit."

of Canterbury, and who became a pliant tool in the hands of the King to carry out his infamous designs. All power cringed before the King, and even his parliament hesitated not to pronounce the offspring of Anne as illegitimate. Catharine divorced, Anne beheaded, room was made now for another queen, and she was soon found in Jane Seymour, to whom Henry was married the next morning after the execution of his "beloved Anne." Agnes Strickland says: "While the last act of that diabolical drama was played out, which consummated the destruction of poor Anne, it appears that her rival had the discretion to retreat to her paternal mansion, Wolf Hall, in Wiltshire. There the preparations for her marriage with Henry VIII were proceeding with sufficient activity to allow her royal wedlock to take place the day after the axe had rendered the King a widower. Henry himself remained in the vicinity of the metropolis, awaiting the accomplishment of that event. The traditions of Richmond Park, and Epping Forest quote each place as the locale of the following scene. On the morning of the 19th of May, Henry VIII, attired for the chase, with his huntsmen and hounds around him was standing under a spreading oak, breathlessly awaiting the signal gun from the Tower, which was to announce that the axe had fallen upon the neck of his once 'entirely beloved Anne Boleyn.' At last, when the bright summer sun rode high toward its meridian, the sullen sound of the death-gun boomed along the windings of the Thames. Henry started with ferocious joy. 'Ha, ha,' he cried with satisfaction, 'the deed is done! Uncouple the hounds and away.' The chase that day bent toward the West, whether the stag led it in that direction or not. At nightfall the King was at Wolf Hall, in Wiltshire, telling the news to his elected bride. The next morning the King married the beautiful Seymour. It is commonly asserted that he wore white for mourning the day after Anne Boleyn's execution; he certainly wore white, not as mourning, but because he on that day wedded her rival."

Vol. 4, p. 219.

What humane heart does not revolt at such unheard of cruelty and brutishness? Who would be willing to call such a

character, a respecter of God and law," or to say "he had an affection to seek His glory?" What a page in this wonderful movement! Anne now was out of the way, Jane Seymour was* Queen in her place, who gave birth to Edward VI,* and after her death, Henry married a German princess, Anne of Cleves. He became disgusted with her appearance, still married her, but soon had her divorced, Cranmer officiating as before. He became now displeased with his prime minister, who lost his head, having been the first victim of his own "law of attainder," and so made room for some one else to fill his place. From now Cranmer stands near the person of the King. The King next married Catharine Howard of the House of Norfolk. After a while he had her divorced, and then beheaded for the crime of treason. What hand his ministers had in divorcing his wives and beheading them is not fully known, but Agnes Strickland opens a window, letting in some light, as follows. "The early follies of Catharine were known to too many, not to have reached the persons most interested in destroying her influence with the King, and if they delayed in striking the blow that was to lay her honors in the dust, it was only to render it more effectual. The 'snake was to be killed, not scotched.' But on that fatal morrow, while Henry was at mass, the paper that contained the particulars of the misconduct of her whom he esteemed such a jewel of womanhood and perfect love to himself was put into his hands by Cranmer, with an humble request that he would read it when he was in entire privacy. . . . When this was reported to the King he sent Cranmer to her in the morning with a deceitful assurance, that if she would acknowledge her transgressions, the King, although her life had been forfeited by the law, had determined to extend unto her his most gracious mercy."

* When the hour came in which the heir of England was expected to see the light, it was by no means the "good hour" so emphatically prayed for in the ceremonial of her retirement. After a martyrdom of suffering, the queen's attendants put to Henry the really cruel question of, whether he would wish the wife or infant to be saved. It is affirmed, and it must be owned the speech is too characteristic of Henry to be doubted that he replied, "The child by all means, for other wives could easily be found." Vol. 4, p. 288, *Queens of England*.

The last one in this catalogue, was Catharine Parr. Poor creature, she narrowly escaped with her life for daring to have an opinion of her own, and she had the good fortune of outliving the king, who had divorced four wives and led two to the block. This certainly, in all conscience, is enough, and where a man is sunk thus low, becoming debased so as to be brutish, we need not wonder that he would plunder, rob and steal. A conscience seared like his, would have allowed him to do at one blow, what, for prudential reasons, he had to do by degrees. To support himself in his licentious course, required large revenues to the crown, and in order to replenish his treasury, he coveted the wealth of the monasteries, "institutions which had been for centuries the nurseries of religion and learning, the comfort to the poor and forsaken," and from which some of the most pious and devoted men came forth. In 1536 a bill was introduced into the Parliament to give to the king the property of those monastic establishments whose annual revenue did not exceed 200 £ sterling. A good beginning. The bill soon passed the house of lords, but met much opposition in the commons. It is said, that Henry sent for the commons, and with a scowl told them that "he would have the bill pass or take off some of their heads." And why should he not, expert as he was, in such business? Terror seized the commons, the bill was passed, and Henry gained his points, thus breaking completely, the spirit of freedom and right for which the Church contended, and wresting all power out of legitimate hands, he made himself supreme both in Church and State. "They (the houses of Parliament) yielded to every mandate of Henry's imperial will; they bent with every breath of his capricious humor; they were responsible for the illegal trial, for the iniquitous attainder, for the sanguinary statute, for the tyranny which they sanctioned by law, and for that, which they permitted without law." Hallam, *Const. Hist. of England*. To gain possession of other property of the Church, we have plans and tricks. The monks were immoral, the monasteries were nests in which opposition to the realm and rebellion was hatched, they were suppressed, the

property secularized, the king and his courtiers parceled out among themselves the property thus seized upon and then went on in riotous living.* Of the destruction of the monasteries, Bishop Short says, "that it was an act of wanton avarice on the part of the king and nobility, and as disastrous in its immediate influence on religion and learning." The total number dissolved was eleven hundred, which yielded an annual revenue of about 150,000 £. Whether that amount would have been of more service in the hands of the Church, where it by right belonged, than in the hands of such a man as the king was, we let the impartial reader determine.

Having now seen the character of the king and how he succeeded in humbling all power and to trample all rights under his feet, it will be interesting also, to see how he stands related to the Church. Cromwell, promoted to the king's privy council, suggested to him that the bishops and clergy had incurred the penalties enacted in the famous statute of *Praemunire*, and that they, with their possessions, were entirely at his mercy. The king acted on this suggestion. He called a convocation of the clergy, who, in alarm, offered the king a present of 100,000 £. to be released from the dreaded penalties of the statute. But the bait would not take, unless they would insert a clause, "acknowledging him to be Supreme Head of the Church of England." It was compromised by inserting, "so far as the law of Christ will allow," fully aware, that at the proper time, he could remove even that. Here is fruit of seed sown twelve centuries ago. More than this; Cromwell was "made spiritual vicar-general of the realm," and as such, he was placed over the heads of the clergy, and became, with the king, Supreme. The king now had everything in his hands—power

* "This would not have satisfied the ends of Henry and his covetous and ambitious agents. They all aimed at the revenues and riches of the religious houses, for which reason no arts or contrivances were to be passed by that might be of use in obtaining those ends. * * As the scheme was managed, therefore, it was a compromise or co-partnership of the king and his courtiers. The lands now lay the open prey of the hardy claimant or the sly intriguer; crowds of suppliants wearied the crown to participate in that national spoliation."—D'Israeli, *Amenities of Literature*.

in the Church and State emanated from the crown—the new vicar-general suggested that the powers of all the bishops be suspended, which was done by Cranmer, assigning as a reason, that a visitation of the dioceses would soon take place by Cromwell. What could the bishops do ? Their power was gone, and we are told, that within a month, under the working of such unholy conduct, “they humbly sued for new faculties from the king to enable them to govern their flocks.” In consequence, a “commission was issued to each bishop separately, authorizing him, *during the king's pleasure, and as the king's deputy*, to ordain persons born within and admit them to livings ; to receive proof of wills ; to determine causes lawfully brought before ecclesiastical tribunals ; to visit the clergy and laity of the diocese ; to inquire into crimes and punish them according to the canon law ; and to do whatever belonged to the office of a bishop, besides those things, which, according to the Sacred Writings, were committed to his charge. The reason assigned was, not that the government of bishops is necessary for the Church, but that the king's vicar-general, on account of the multiplicity of business with which he was loaded, could not be everywhere present, and that many inconveniences might arise if delay and interruptions were admitted in the exercise of his authority.” Was not the power of the Pope cast off, and is there not here a power, taking his place, which is riding them, and degrading, and stripping them of all ecclesiastical rights ? In order to establish himself firmly, and “dispel these prejudices, Henry issued injunctions that the very name of *Pope* should be carefully erased out of all books employed in the public worship : that every schoolmaster should diligently inculcate the new doctrine to the children entrusted to his care : that all clergymen, from the bishop to the curate, should on every Sunday and holiday teach, that the king was the true head of the Church, &c. &c.” The Church now became the creature of the crown. The king was the Pope ! Accordingly, in the year 1536, a book was compiled, called a Book of Articles, which the clergy subscribed, for what else could they do, in which it was affirmed, “that a belief in the three an-

cient Creeds, the Apostles', the Nicene, the Athanasian, is necessary to salvation : that the Sacraments of Baptism, Penance and the Holy Eucharist are the ordinary means of salvation, and that the use of Masses, the honoring and invoking of Saints and the usual ceremonies of the public service, "are highly profitable, and ought to be retained." Shortly after, followed the "bloody six," inculcating "the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, the sufficiency of Communion under one kind, the celibacy of the clergy as obligatory by the Divine law, the binding force of vows of chastity, the lawfulness of low Masses, and the obligation of auricular confession." The punishment affixed to the rejection or violation of any one was fearful. Cranmer subscribed them (though it is said he had secretly married a wife) and helped to enforce them. Under the working of these "bloody six," Catholic as well as Protestant was made to suffer, the Catholics were hanged and quartered as traitors, the Protestants were burned as heretics. Under such a state of things, what could be expected from the people? When did popery ever do more? From this tyranny the realm was delivered, by the death of the king, the supreme head of Church and State, in 1547.

ACCESSION OF EDWARD VI.

Edward was in his 9th year when the affairs of Church and State were thrown upon him. Cranmer managed the spiritual, the Duke of Somerset, as Lord Protector, the temporal. Cranmer now developed his plan. Here it is. "He humbly petitioned the crown to be restored to the Episcopal jurisdiction, which, according to his favorite theory, had *wholly ceased* with the death of the late King ; and most of the other bishops followed his obsequious example." Again : "In conformity with his well-known opinion and practice, the parliament solemnly declared that all jurisdiction, both spiritual and temporal, is derived *entirely from the King*, and hence, the election of bishops was withdrawn from the dean and chapters and vested wholly in the crown ; and the bishops of course became mere state officials." Alas ! for the succession. The mass of the people, however, were at

heart, not satisfied with this change, and could not be so easily estranged from the ancient faith. Says Hallam, *Con. His.*: "But the common people, especially in remote countries, had been used to an implicit reverence for the Holy See, and had suffered comparatively little by its impositions. They looked up also to their own teachers, as *guides in faith*; and the main body of the clergy were very reluctant to tear themselves, at the pleasure of a disappointed monarch, in the most dangerous crisis of religion, from the bosom of Catholic unity." Burnet "confesses that all endeavors were too weak to overcome the aversion of the people toward reformation, and even intimates that German troops were sent for from Calais, on account of the bigotry with which the bulk of the nation adhered to the old superstition. *This is a somewhat humiliating admission, that the Protestant faith was imposed upon our ancestors by a foreign army.*"

The same system of spoliation was continued under Edward VI, as under Henry VIII, and the affairs of the church regulated according to the pleasure of Cranmer and his assistants. Macaulay and Mackintosh, able men, in their *History of England and Miscellanies* say: "Here zeal was the tool of worldliness. A King whose character may be best described by saying, that he was despotism itself personified, unprincipled ministers, a rapacious aristocracy, a servile parliament. Such were the instruments by which England was delivered from the yoke of Rome. The work which had been begun by Henry, the murderer of his wives, was continued by Somerset, the murderer of his brother, and completed by Elizabeth, the murderer of her guest. Sprung from brutal passion, nurtured by selfish policy, the Reformation in England displayed little of what had in other countries distinguished it." The execution of More marks the moment of the transition of his government from joviality and parade to a species of atrocity which distinguishes it from, and perhaps above, any other European tyranny. . . . He is the only prince of modern times, who carried judicial murder into his bed, and imbrued his hands in the blood of those whom he had caressed."

We have now a series of changes. After the accession of Mary, she attempted to undo what had been done and lead the realm back to Catholic unity.* The spirit of these rulers, actuating them, seems to have been the same. "The difference in this respect between the Catholics and Protestants was only in degree, and in degree there was much less difference than we are apt to believe. Persecution is *the deadly original sin of the reformed Churches*; that which cools every honest man's zeal for their cause, in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive." Hallam. The pointer now comes to the place on the dial, where the reckoning with these men took place, for the injury which had been done. Ridley and Latimer, refusing to recant, were burnt at the stake. Cranmer recanted seven times. "He acknowledged that he had been a greater persecutor of the church than Paul, and wished that, like Paul, he might be able to make amends. He could not rebuild what he had destroyed, but as the penitent thief on the cross, by the testimony of his lips, he might obtain mercy of the Almighty. He was unworthy of favor, and worthy not only of temporal, but eternal punishment. He had offended against King Henry and Queen Catharine; he was the cause and author of the divorce, and also of the evils which resulted from it. He had blasphemed against the Sacrament, had sinned against heaven, and had deprived men of the benefits to be derived from the Eucharist." —Strype. After having retracted so often, we are told that he had prepared a retraction of the former retractions, which he intended to read at the stake if not pardoned, and which he did read, after which he thrust his right hand into the fire, and,

* The history of the Reformation in England is full of strange problems. . . . During the twelve or thirteen years which followed the death of Henry VIII the religion of the Church was thrice changed. Protestantism was established by Edward: the Catholic Church was restored by Mary; Protestantism was again established by Elizabeth. The faith of the nation seemed to depend on the personal inclinations of the sovereign. Nor was this all. An established church was then, as a matter of course, a persecuting church. Edward persecuted Catholics, Mary persecuted Protestants, Elizabeth persecuted Catholics again. The father of these three sovereigns had enjoyed the pleasure of persecuting both these sects at once; and had sent to death on the same hurdle, the heretic who denied the real presence, and the traitor who denied the royal supremacy."—Macaulay, *Miss.*

as an unwilling martyr, perished in the flames. We have a severe criticism passed on the character of this time-serving man, by Macaulay in his review of Hallam's *Con. His.*, fully sustaining what we have already said, the length of which forbids us to transcribe it. Bishop Short says of Mary: "Her foundations were made out of the revenues of the crown, and instead of making a gain of godliness, as was the general plan of the Reformation, she offered not unto the Lord of that which cost her nothing. Among other donations, she gave some rectories, which were in the hands of the crown, to Oxford, to repair the schools, and restored the temporalities to Durham, which had been taken away as a prey for the Duke of Northumberland."

ACCESSION OF ELIZABETH.

Under her reign we have the formal establishment by law, of what had been commenced by Henry and Edward. She ascended the throne in 1558. What her religious convictions really were, it is hard to determine. It is said, that she conformed to the Catholic faith, but her religious convictions, sincere or insincere, could not remain long concealed and, no doubt, she was led to gratify personal feeling and revenge. She well knew the position of the Roman See, in reference to the divorce of Queen Catharine, and that she was regarded as illegitimate, and illegally held the crown. Accordingly, she set about to abolish the Catholic religion in England, and to set up another, and then too, to rid herself of her Catholic rival, in the person of Mary, Queen of Scots: which she did by having her destroyed. Now firmly fixed on the throne, she determined on her policy, and gathered around her servants to carry it out. The principal man was Cecil, pardoned by Mary for having participated in the treason of Northumberland. Cecil became the chief in her council, and lent himself in wiping out every vestige of the old Church. In the first month of her reign, Cecil suggested, which she accepted, "to forbid all manner of sermons, that the preachers might not excite their hearers to resistance, to intimidate the clergy by prosecutions under the statute of præ-

munire and other penal laws, to debase, in the eyes of the people, all who had been in authority under the late queen, by rigorous inquiries into their conduct, and by bringing them, whenever it was possible under the lash of the law," &c. All this boded no good for the Church. In this fear the bishops were not disappointed, for soon some of them were seized, as was Bishop White of Winchester, and a royal proclamation appeared, forbidding the clergy to preach, and ordering the established worship to be observed "until consultation might be had in parliament by the queen and the three estates." "Oglethorpe, bishop of Carlisle, when about to celebrate Mass in the royal chapel on Christmas day, received an order not to elevate the Sacred Host in the queen's presence. He replied, with noble independence, "that his life was the queen's, but his conscience his own; on which Elizabeth, rising immediately after the Gospel, retired with her attendants." She was crowned by Oglethorpe, according to the entire service, she taking the oath in the usual form, which was solemnly sealed by the reception of the Holy Sacrament.*

In order to carry out her plan, she, with her managers, looked to parliament, and when that had been properly packed, the bill to abolish the old, and to establish the new order, passed the house of commons without much opposition, but in the other house only after a stormy debate. In the convocation of the clergy it experienced a most vigorous and unanimous, but fruitless opposition. This body presented to the house of lords a memorial "declaring their full and unshaken faith in all the articles of the Catholic faith," protesting "that to decide on doctrine, sacraments and discipline belonged, not to any lay assembly, but to the lawful pastors of the Church." But even these obstacles were overcome. Cecil, by some adroit manœuvring succeeded in silencing the most formidable part of this op-

* "Elizabeth did not refuse to take the ordinary oath to maintain the Catholic faith, and preserve the privileges and liberties of the church; . . . She allowed herself to be anointed, although with scorn and disdain; for when she had retired into her pavilion to take the royal habit, she said to her maids of honor: 'Don't approach me, that stinking oil would give you heartache.'"

position by arresting the bishops of Westminster and Lincoln, committing them to the tower, and binding over others, until judgment should be pronounced on them. With all those threats, and silencing of some of the opposition, "there were those that would not consent to violate their consciences by their vote. The additional bill in favor of the new book of common prayer, was adopted by the small majority of three, nine temporal and nine spiritual lords—including all the bishops who could be in attendance, voting against its passage." Her parliament was ready to do her bidding, by passing laws and hedging in the newly established order, and shows how completely all power had been vested in her, and "it might be delegated to any person or persons whatever, at the pleasure of the sovereign." The articles to be believed in were, in her reign, reduced to 39, instead of 42 as under Edward, and the "bloody six" under Henry. She was now firmly fixed, not only as Queen, but as head of the church. Whether the Roman Pontiff ever claimed more, and whether he ever showed greater tyranny, and whether his demands were not more in accordance with justice and right, than these of this newly constituted Popess is a question admitting of debate. But some of the bishops fought it "out on this line," even to the bitter end, by refusing to take the oath of Supremacy. They suffered deposition and imprisonment, all of which resulted in great injury to the church and the cause of Christ. Bishop Short says: "All the bishops, with the exception of one only, Kitchin of Llandaff, refused to do so (to take the oath of supremacy,) and were ejected from their sees, to the number of fourteen." The Archbishop of Canterbury died in July, 1558. Elizabeth, as head of the church, appointed Matthew Parker to fill the place. But how was he to be consecrated, seeing, that all, but one, of the Catholic bishops had been deposed? "The difficult case was referred by the council to six learned theologians and canonists, who decided that in such an emergency, the queen, as supreme head of the church, had authority to supply all deficiencies."*

* Sanders on the Anglican Reformation says, . . . "And thus as they were commonly reputed to be, destitute of *all lawful ordination*, and by the very laws of

Here comes in the question of Parker's consecration; a question that has been discussed by able men, who filled volumes, yet withal the question is still not clear, as may be seen from the above history, reciting how these singular scenes were being enacted. In reference to the consecrators, there is a mystery, for they were deprived of right under the last reign; besides, the fact, that the valid consecration of Barlowe, the principal consecrator, had been called in question. "Neither Archbishop Bramhall, with all his industry; nor Mason, with all his art; nor Burnet, with all his researches; nor Weston, with all his learning, could ever find out the useful documents." . . . "It is a wonderful thing," says Stephens, "by what chance or providence it happened that Barlowe's consecration, who was the principal actor in this, should nowhere appear, nor any positive proof of it be found in more than fourscore years since it was first questioned, by all the search that could be made by so many learned and industrious and curious persons."

Whatever may be said, for or against the argument in reference to the validity of his consecration, it must be admitted, from the plain facts of history as above recited, that the succession is not as clear and fully made out, as we are told by the Anglican Church. Who can read such a recital of historical facts, without having his mind disturbed with doubts in regard to this point? By the Episcopal church, ordination is denied to us; and yet, when we candidly investigate the fact, ordination in the German branch is, perhaps, as clear and as fully established as this in the English. Wherein do they differ? The English repudiated the Catholic church, and in turn was repudiated by the latter. So in Germany. * The Reformers repudiated the Roman See, that repudiated them. Now, if the Anglican church had power, which she lawfully exercised, so did they claim on the Continent, where did the authority proceed

England were proved not to be bishops, they were obliged to implore the arm of the civil power, that they might obtain the sanction of the lay magistrate, in a subsequent parliament. By authority of which, whatever had been done irregularly, or unlawfully, or whatever had been omitted in their inauguration, might be pardoned them; this, after they had discharged the episcopal office and occupied sees some years, without any episcopal consecration. Hence they obtained the name of *Parliamentary Bishops*.

from? Bishops had been suspended; new ones made; where did this authority proceed from? Evidently, here both are on the same level; and there can be no doubt that the ordination in our branch is as valid as that of the Episcopal clergy, seeing the great confusion and doubt, especially in this case, and we cannot see how, under any circumstances, ordination could be repeated. The claim set up by them as the only consecrated ministry is untenable, in the face of such a history as that of Henry VIII and Queen Elizabeth, supreme heads of the church, the source of spiritual authority.

How Elizabeth accomplished the full establishment of her religion and the suppression of the old order, the after history clearly sets forth, which was done "by legal enactments; by subjecting dissenters to torture in every way, compelling them to become submissive and obedient to her will." This, space and time will fail us to notice. It is truly a sad history, and will not suffer, when placed side by side with the darkest page of papal persecution and torture. It is said that "during the last fourteen years of her reign, sixty-one clergymen, forty-seven laymen, and two gentlewomen suffered capital punishment for some or other of the spiritual felonies and treasons which had been lately created." During her entire reign, it is said "that one hundred and twenty-four clergymen suffered the cruel death of traitors, of whom one hundred and fourteen were secular priests, eight Jesuits, one Monk, and one Friar." Hallam tells us that the rack was used as a torture in her reign. "The rack seldom stood idle in the tower for all the latter part of Elizabeth's reign," &c. In reference to the number destroyed, Hallam confirms the statement above made. Yet in spite of these fierce and cruel persecutions against a people loyal to the crown, but who were unwilling to yield their consciences into the keeping of such a tyrant, the flame of religion, after the old order, was kept alive; as Hallam tells us, "Priests therefore traveled the country in various disguises, to keep alive the flame which the practice of outward conformity was likely to extinguish." "By stealth, at the dead of night, in private chambers, in the secret lurking place of an ill-peopled country, with all the mystery

that subdues the imagination, with all the mutual trust that invigorates constancy, these proscribed ecclesiastics celebrated their solemn rites more impressively in such concealment than if surrounded by all their former splendor." Hallam further says: "The statutes of Elizabeth's reign comprehend every one of these progressive degrees of restraint and persecution.

. . . . The necessity, I am persuaded, can never be made out; the statutes were, in many instances, absolutely unjust; in others, not demanded by circumstances; in almost all prompted by religious bigotry, by excessive apprehension, or by the arbitrary spirit with which our Government was administered under Elizabeth." Bishop Short says, "The ravage which was committed by Henry was the wasteful prodigality of a tyrant." . . . "Under Edward, the monarch was too weak to resist the avarice of those who governed, and Mary rather enriched than robbed the establishment; but Elizabeth laid her hands on all she could grasp, though, for the sake of keeping up appearances, she restored some small portion in foundations connected with education. The poverty of the church, in the early part of the reign of Elizabeth, was excessive; not only among the higher clergy, who were exposed to these attacks from the court, but among the lower and laborious individuals, who possess no dignified station, and have no further worldly prospect than to provide bread for themselves and their families." In reference to the persecutions under Elizabeth, Agnes Strickland says: . . . "That the unsparing use of the rack, the gibbet, and the quartering knife failed either to silence the zeal of the Puritans, or to deter the seminary priests from performing their perilous missions as teachers of their proscribed doctrines." Macaulay says: "Non-conformity was severely punished. The Queen prescribed the exact rule of religious faith and discipline, and whoever departed from that rule, either to the right or to the left, was in danger of severe punishment." In reference to her end, Agnes Strickland says: "It is almost a fearful task to trace the passage of the mighty Elizabeth through the dark valley of the shadow of death. Many have been dazzled with the splendor of her life, but few, even of her

most ardent admirers, would wish their last end might be like her's." "The Queen kept her bed fifteen days," continues Lady Southwell, "besides the three days she sat upon a stool; and one day while being pulled up by force, she obstinately stood on her feet for fifteen hours. When she was near her end the council sent to her the Archbishop of Canterbury, and other prelates, at the sight of whom she was much offended, cholericly rating them, bidding them 'be packing,' saying 'she was no atheist, but she knew full well they were but hedge priests.'"

Such is a sketch of this wonderful movement, in the sixteenth century, in England, as presented by historians, who endeavor to give history as it transpired, and not to support a particular theory whether of Church or State. It may not be uninteresting to look it full in the face, in all its extent, to see what it involves, when dissatisfied with our Church relations, and we become desirous of changing them. To do this fully and frankly, to admit the true force of history, which of right belongs to this movement, as well as that in Germany, of which our partial historians say nothing, but carefully give only the bright side of the picture, would enable us to go far, in the solution of the great problem of Protestantism which is to be solved. If we could only be candid enough, to admit for the sake of truth, that there were gross defects in the men who led these movements in the sixteenth century, and acknowledge their inconsistencies, while we look equally in earnest at those of the Papacy, discarding them on both sides, and accepting that which is true and right, no matter where found, we would, no doubt, be prepared to reach a higher stadium and come nearer

Note. The aim of the foregoing article is merely to bring to view the human agents, and their work in this movement, without any attempt to trace the divine guidance, overruling all. We have been led, to a great extent, to regard the actors in the movements of the sixteenth century, as entirely free from fault, and their work above criticism, engendering the spirit of pride, and "becoming vainly puffed up." In the conflict now before us, it is proper and right that we should know and understand, what these antecedents are. Of the character of the Popes and their Legates it was not the aim of the writer to speak, neither has he any apology to make for them, but in candor and charity, gives them credit, where, in his judgment, it is deserved. The authorities cited in the article, are those known to every reader of history.

to the "Church of the Future," where, "they all shall be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us."

ART. III.—THE BEGINNINGS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

BY REV. PROF. THEODORE APPEL, LANCASTER, PA.

Die Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche und ihrer Verfassung. Ein geschichtlicher Versuch von Richard Rothe. Wittenberg, 1837.

History of the Apostolic Church with a general Introduction to Church History, by Philip Schaff. New York: Scribner, 1853.

CHRISTIANITY and the Christian Church are closely and vitally connected together, so much so that the one could not be said to exist without the other. The latter is something more than a merely human contrivance, designed to protect those who are in it from the attacks of Satan, as the walls of a city defend its inhabitants from besieging hosts. It is the embodiment of all the living forces included in the former, the home of the Holy Ghost, through whom the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ in all its power is revealed to men and brought to bear upon the world at large. According to St. Paul, the relation between the two is the same as that of the soul to the body, and, therefore, he calls the Church the Body of Christ. If this is not merely oriental imagery, which may God ever protect us from believing, it means that, whilst they are different, they are nevertheless one and inseparable, necessarily united, once and forever. As the body without the soul is a corpse, and as the soul without the body is an abstraction or a ghost, so the actual existence of Christianity in the world, requires the necessary existence of the Church as its counterpart. The one is the inside, the other, the outside of the same living process.

In consequence of this connection, it follows that in order to understand the nature, constitution, rise, progress, or history of the Church, it is necessary, that we should have a correct and adequate idea of Christianity, its informing power. Apart from this, we must see the whole process in a wrong light, and must be continually at the mercy of our unreal, subjective fancies. This is so evident, that facts or proofs to support it seem to be superfluous. Every religious sect down to those, which scarcely deserve to be called any longer Christian, has its own view of the Church, of early Christianity, and of Church history, in which it differs from all its neighbors higher or lower in their Christian character, upon which it builds and for which it is ready to stand or fall. The Christianity of the early ages, so far as it was pure and uncorrupted, it supposes, was the same as its own, nothing higher, deeper, nor wider. In the nature of the case, therefore, where so many and such contradictory views prevail in regard to the same fact, there must be a vast amount of pure subjectivity, of errors numerous enough to fill more than one of Lord Bacon's dens for such kinds of idols.

Fortunately our modern evangelical Theology, in the proper sense of the term, has turned attention away from matters comparatively non-essential, to the consideration of the peculiar essential character of Christianity itself. Schleiermacher in Germany more than any one else, deserves the credit for giving this direction to the religious thinking of our age. At a time of self-inflated illuminism, when, in his own country at least, it was supposed that Christianity had outlived itself, he it was who showed to the superficial thinkers of his day, that Christianity included in itself much more than what they had ever thought of before, something vastly more enduring than dogmas, confessions, or outward forms. He started this fundamental inquiry, without, however, fully satisfying it. In the hands of others, it has been prolific of much good fruit; so that in our day, the science, as it may be called, of Christianity is no doubt better understood than in any of the ages that are past; simply because never before was so much of earnest and enduring attention paid to it. In the columns of this periodical, the sub-

ject has come up frequently, and been discussed earnestly from various points of view, not without rendering important help, as we think, in the solution of the general question.

Taking it for granted that the latest results in the progress of Theology, in Germany, England, and to some extent also in this country, have supplied us with a more correct theoretical view of Christianity, we shall employ it in this article to show how the outward historical Church took its rise, assumed form and shape, and became a central fact in the world's history. In doing so it will be necessary, we are aware, to repeat much that has been said already in these pages; but the unity of our theme requires it, and it is a desideratum that the two most important and comprehensive facts in history, Christianity and the Church, should be held up at the present time in their vital relation to each other. In this light they are always presented to our view in the Word of God, but not always in our preaching and theological literature. The consequence of such violent putting asunder of what God has joined together, is that both are deprived of their real, positive, and vital character.

Christianity, as a system of redemption, as a fundamental fact brought to pass by the God-man, is something fundamental to the human race, much more so than any other, lying back, as it were, of all our particular human activities, but so related to them throughout, as to touch them at every point. The most general conception which we can form of it is that of a vast and comprehensive *power or force* in the human world, in many respects analogous to the force of gravitation in the natural. It is, however, raised infinitely above the forces of the physical creation, inasmuch as it has to do with living human beings, complex in their structure; and endowed with the principle of freedom and personality, a ruling principle adapted to the necessities of such a case must be something much higher and more refined than the simple forces of attraction or repulsion which rule in the material world. It must have all the characteristics of *life* itself, as broad as the race and commensurate with its necessities and wants. Hence the fact of redemption in the Scriptures is always referred back to a new spiritual life intro-

duced into the world by the advent of Jesus Christ. So numerous are the passages in the Bible, both in the gospels and epistles, that time would fail us, if we should refer to them here in detail. They will occur to the reader spontaneously in all their variety, from those that refer to the new birth and the living vine, onward to the passage in which Christians are said to be living stones in the temple of God. In this last instance, where dead, inorganic matter, stones, are used for the purpose of illustration, the figure is felt to be inadequate; and the apostle, in order that the living power residing in believers, which was always uppermost in his mind, might not be overlooked, calls them *living* stones, in violation of the rules of rhetoric, on the principle that the higher law must rule the lower.

The new life, however, thus introduced into history, in order that it might accomplish the object in view, could not be of a character extraneous to man: it must be purely and distinctly *human*. Otherwise it could find no point of connection, no maternal source in the bosom of humanity. We may conceive of higher or lower orders of life, as we see in nature, where they exist independently of each other, without the possibility of the one taking the place of the other. In the case of animals of different species, where a union of life takes place to any extent, the result is a monstrosity. So the new life infused into our common humanity, could not come to us from pure beings of other spheres, not from angelic beings, nor from any other kind. In order that it may be strictly human, so as to meet the demands of the case, it must come from man himself. All this is involved in the proposition of the Apostle, where he says, For as by man came death, by man came also the resurrection from the dead (1 Cor. xv. 21).

But how shall this be accomplished? How shall man, who is said to be dead, be the source of life to himself? This Scriptural paradox is answered and the difficulty removed, by the mysterious union of the human and divine natures in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, whereby our frail human nature was taken up and purified by its union with the divine, so as to become a fountain of life and immortality to the world

dead in trespasses and sins. As God never works magically nor mechanically in the human world, but always in harmony with the laws of the constitution of man, so it was in this particular case. He might have operated upon him much as galvanism acts upon a corpse, producing spasmodic motion, but not the glow of life and health. We know that He did not do so. He saw in man something more than single individuals or transient phenomena; He had given him a generic nature, something different from individuality or personality, and yet always connected with it as its life or deepest ground. The term *humanity* is a fact, an actual existence in our world, an entity, not a mere abstraction. So it is regarded in the Bible, and in the confessions of the Christian Church generally. It is this that constitutes the unity of the race, as well as its diversity; it is also the source which determines the character and destiny of men generally for weal or for woe. It is a distinction not often made in works which treat of the nature and constitution of man, but one which must stand out in prominent relief in every true system of Theology, notwithstanding the boasted triumphs of the nominalist over the realist in the schools of philosophy. It was the actual medium through which sin and death have been propagated from our first parents down through successive ages by natural descent. Without it, it would be absurd to suppose that sin descends at all from parents to their children. Besides, it is philosophically false to conceive of individuals as having any independent existence whatever, apart from the species or genus to which they belong.

Now when God proposed to redeem our race and to restore to it its lost life, He had regard to this fact in our primitive, original constitution. His system of gracious influences commenced with the root of the evil, not at its effects or outward manifestations. As humanity, our generic life, was corrupt and diseased, He proceeded first to heal it, and so to restore it to its healthy, normal condition. This, as we have said, He accomplished by the Incarnation, in which Christ, the Son of God took upon Himself our flesh or nature, and so became bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh. He did not unite Himself to

any individual man, as this would have rendered Him a double being, consisting of two distinct persons, a dualism, which idea the Church has always rejected. It was sufficient, and no doubt the only possible course of procedure in the circumstances, that He should unite himself to our humanity, which He received from the Virgin Mary by the operation of the Holy Ghost, purify and sanctify it by an organic union with His own heavenly, divine nature and personality, and thus constitute in Himself a new fountain of humanity, from which the race should take a new start, and its history should flow forth in multitudinous streams of blessings to the world at large. He found our poor, prostrate human nature a putrid stream, a stagnant, noxious pool, sending forth poisonous, pestilential effluvia, the resort of doleful creatures, noxious reptiles, and foul birds of prey. But when he brought it to confront His heavenly presence, a process of attraction or evaporation, so to speak, commenced; every thing purely human ascended, leaving all its impurities behind, and, distilled through the alembic of the skies, it descended again in fructifying showers of pure, living waters, to refresh the parched soil of our famine-stricken earth:

In entire harmony with this view of the case, is the remarkable fact, that our Saviour in all His words and works refers His hearers continually to Himself, to His own person, as the source of salvation and eternal life. When He told the multitude, not to labor for the bread that perisheth, but for that bread that endureth unto eternal life, which the Son of Man should give them, they in accordance with their Jewish way of thinking, thought that He intended to prescribe for them an external work or legalistic observance, and inquired what they were to do that they might work the works of God. To correct this inveterate tendency to depend on outward works, and to arouse their sluggish minds, He calls away their thoughts from everything of an external character, and fixes their attention upon Himself. This is the work of God, He told them, that ye believe on Him whom the Father hath sent (John vi. 29). They already believed in God, but it was all important that they should believe in Him also. This was what He intended to effect

by the miracle of the loaves and the fishes on the previous day. They believed that God, the Father, gave them their daily bread, but it was also necessary that they should believe that it came to them through God, the Son. This they could be brought to see and feel only by such a miracle as the one just referred to. But having proved to them that they were dependent on Him, no less than their heavenly Father for their temporal subsistence, He proceeds to teach them, that He was also the source of a still higher, a spiritual or eternal life to their souls. He had spoken to them of the bread that endureth unto eternal life, not like the manna, which their fathers had eaten in the wilderness; and now to prevent them from supposing that the bread they had eaten the day before, His doctrine, His works, or anything else outside of Himself, was the bread of life, He brings them back once more to His own person, and assures them that *He Himself* was that bread of life, literally and without a figure, the bread of life. The bread of God, He says, is He which cometh down from heaven. These words made a deep impression on the minds of His simple-minded hearers, strengthened, no doubt, by the deep earnestness of the Saviour's countenance and voice. They are silent, and ask no more quibbling questions. The darkness, which had hitherto enshrouded their minds began to vanish, and light from the eternal world, to break through the intervening clouds of ignorance and prejudice. Faith in the God-man, trembles on the horizon of their souls, and they exclaim: Lord, evermore give us this bread to eat. Their prayer was, to be in communication with such a fountain of life continually and for all time, as a source of good, compared with which all other forms of good were of comparatively small account.

The Saviour then goes on, in the remainder of His discourse, to confirm the good impression, which had just been made, to show to the people, that He was the source of life and immortality, and that He was the true bread of life, which could satisfy the wants of fallen humanity and impart to it life, health, and vigor. He does not, however, concern Himself to make the matter clearer, or more intelligible to their natural understand-

ing. Rather, He increases their difficulty by the use of hard words, of strange and extraordinary language, such as had never been heard of before. In the further unfolding of the subject, He says, Except ye eat the flesh of the *Son of Man*, and drink His blood; ye have no life in you. As the living Father hath sent me and I live by the Father, so He that *eateth Me*, even he shall live by Me. Such language no other human being had ever used before, or even thought of using. Had it been employed in the palmy days of Greece in the Academy, in the Lyceum, or on the Porch, it would have met with a storm of hisses from the scholars of that day, and been regarded most probably as the ravings of a madman. Philosophers generally have been wont to make no account of their person in their instructions; they have preferred to conceal themselves behind their systems, and have always referred to their doctrines or books, as the medicine which they had come to prescribe for the souls of their fellow-men. Mohammed, who wished to pursue a career equal or superior to that of Jesus of Nazareth, did not claim for himself any healing powers; whatever he did or said, he professed had come from the one God, of whom he was only the prophet or organ. The difference here noticed can be explained only on the supposition, that Christ regarded Himself as occupying a relation to our race, which no other human being could occupy, and that the extraordinary language, which He uses in this 6th chapter of St. John, was intended to express a truth, which had never before entered the thoughts, much less the language of men. At the close of His discourse, He explains Himself, but only in order to prevent a gross misconception of His meaning. By His flesh and blood, he did not wish them to understand so many particles of matter, so much fibre, so many globules of blood. These in themselves could not constitute either flesh or blood. It was the living power behind them, so to speak, which organized so many particles, that constituted them flesh and blood. To eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, means, therefore, a living union with Him, a participation of His *divine-human life*, a union with that pure humanity, which He had gathered up and sanctified in His own person, with the view of imparting it to the world at large.

We are aware that it is a common impression that the Saviour here, as well as elsewhere, when speaking of His mystical union with believers, employs only strongly figurative language, and that all attempt to make more out of it, is simply mysticism. There is we grant, a mystery here, an awful and stupendous mystery, but that does not destroy its character as a fact and a truth of the most enduring importance. During the sixteenth century, so precious and so far reaching was the doctrine of the Saviour's flesh regarded, that it threw the Christian world into a commotion, which continued for many years; because it was supposed that it was in danger of being rejected. Many thanks to brave old Luther, whose faith and pertinacity, preserved it as a precious inheritance for one part of the Protestant Church, and to John Calvin, who with equal faith and a sterner logic, achieved a like result for the other part.

But is there no danger of carrying the analogy too far? It is intimated, especially by persons in this country, that this whole method of representation is pantheistic, if not gross pantheism itself. We apprehend that such persons have no adequate idea of the great truth that lies at the foundation of pantheism, and of course, are not in a condition, to see that it is the Incarnation, with its divine-human Mediator, uniting heaven and earth, man and God, which cuts up all pantheism by its roots, deprives it of all occupation in the sphere of abstract thinking, and conserves the great truth, which has given it such a potent charm to the great thinkers of all ages of the world. In the "incarnate mystery," we in the simplicity of our faith, see not the danger, but the cure of Pantheism, Buddhism, and all other great errors of the heathen world. At the same time, we are free to confess, and most firmly do we maintain, that whilst the glorified humanity of Christ in its action upon men, does not deify them, it does nevertheless elevate them almost infinitely above the plane of their natural, unregenerate state. It accomplishes for them something more than deliverance from death, or restoration to moral purity. By and through their sanctification, it invests them with powers and prerogatives, such as had never entered the natural understanding to conceive

of; it enables them to tread on serpents, and gives them power over the adversary; it makes them kings and priests unto God, and restores to man the sovereignty over the natural world, which he lost by the fall. All this is exemplified in the life of our Saviour. As the Son of God, He could receive nothing, for he possessed all things by an eternal inheritance; but as the Son of Man He must receive every thing. As the Son of Man, He received the power, with which He performed miracles, walked on the sea, and raised the dead; so from Him as the Son of Man, believers receive power to do the same works, and, as He says, even greater works. Hence the multitude glorified God, who had given such power to *men*. Matt. ix. 8. Man may be elevated, as we know he is by the presence of the Holy Ghost in humanity, without any danger of our thinking for a moment that he is in any sense deified. Not only so, but as believers in Christ, the Son of Man, we are bound to believe, that man is to be immensely exalted by Christianity, and invested with powers and prerogatives over nature and the world of darkness, that will constitute him really and truly the sovereign under God in the sphere in which he lives; such as he would have been, had not sin separated him from union with the eternal Logos. This, we conceive, is the great truth, which lies at the foundation of the doctrine of the *Communicatio Idiomatum* of the Lutheran Church. Such a doctrine, we may be assured, could not have been elaborated with so much care by so many and such distinguished divines, unless it had some substantial Christian basis for its foundation.

This divine-human life, proceeding from the Saviour, and entering into history as the most comprehensive of all other powers, must, we now remark, have all the characteristics of a real and true life. It must be *organic*, not of course in a physical or a materialistic sense. Life may be in the highest degree spiritual, and yet organic and generic in its processes; to be life at all, it must tend continually towards an organization commensurate with its character. As something inward it can in fact have no existence whatever, except as it has become also outward; nor can it remain in a healthy and vigorous state, except as it has free course thus to become objective to itself.

Christianity, indeed, as the deepest and most comprehensive life of the world, compared with which all other forms of life are only typical, phenomenal and transitory, ought, and as we shall try to show, does show this tendency towards organization everywhere and always in the highest degree. As a new determining power for humanity at large, once entering in an actual way into the history of the world, it must have an historical development, and must appear under the form under which humanity unfolds itself generally, that is, it must take up the social principle, and appear necessarily under the form of society, a religious community pervaded by a common life. This is true of every form of religious life, but much more must this be the case with Christianity, which is the absolute form of human life, intended to bring it to a full consciousness of itself and to a full development of all its hidden possibilities.

Originally this life of Christ is hidden in the soul of believers, and is mainly internal, showing itself in a new form of self-consciousness or feeling, a Christ-consciousness, and then under the forms of thought and will. But it cannot continue to exist as something purely internal or subjective. There exists within it, as in all other kinds of life, an immanent necessity or impulse to externalize itself, and so to create for itself also a real outward existence. Its very vitality depends on this autonomic power, and its intensity on the freedom with which this impulse or tendency is allowed to act. The one simply strengthens and confirms the other. A purely subjective religion is either in a diseased state, or if healthy, but prevented from externalizing itself in some outward and appropriate form, it must become diseased, and die out like fire in the absence of enkindling fuel.

This outward form, as we have said, is conditioned by the social principle, which rules universally in the general life of humanity, and becomes the Christian Church, the only form in which the divine-human life of the Redeemer appears in history. The internal feeling of communion, awakened in believers by union with Christ through the Holy Ghost, can be satisfied only by an external communion, in which it shall be kept up and have free course to unfold itself. This must be of a character

to correspond with its own peculiar nature, and extend just as far as it is generic and human. But as the life of Christ is humanity itself, elevated and sanctified by the human with the godhead in His person, as already said, it follows that Christianity must penetrate the whole race, like leaven, reorganize it, and give it a new form, answerable to its own general or universal character. Nothing short of this will meet the demands of the case. Whilst in unregenerated humanity the world over, there is a deep longing for redemption, for unity, harmony, and peace among all men, much more is this the case in that renewed form of humanity that shows itself in all true Christians. There has been a loud and earnest call, proceeding from the Christian consciousness of all ages, for unity, universality, and catholicity in the communion of saints. At the present day, when Christendom is divided, it shows itself often spontaneously; and often also in the collisions, bickerings, and controversies of different religious denominations; for did not each possess in itself the feeling of catholicity as its end, there could be no room for jealousy; each might be content to occupy its own territory in peace with its neighbors, as was the case with the religions of antiquity. But, as history goes to show, stronger perhaps than ever since was this feeling among believers in the beginning. It was inherent in the new life and spirit that moved upon the face of the general mind of the Church. The communion that was forming, the family of God that was gathered together, the Church that was to be built up, must exhibit the attributes of *unity* and *catholicity*. This was a postulate.

Rothe after showing the necessity of the Church, as the outward form of the living power of Christianity, starts an inquiry in regard to the particular form it is destined to assume in the end, and, after an elaborate analysis of the idea both of the Church and State, arrives at the startling conclusion, that the State must eventually absorb the Church and render its continued existence unnecessary. Thus far, and it may be for ages to come, the Church has been a necessity, because the State has not been sufficiently pervaded by the spirit of Christianity; but when that is once the case, far in the future, as he and most

other persons would suppose, the Church, which has been a beneficial though temporary arrangement, will pass away, and the State will take out of its hands its heavenly functions, such as government, teaching, education, doctrine, worship, and culture. He professes to arrive at this conclusion, by an independent process of reasoning on the idea and design of the State, which is highly refreshing as compared with the low, materialistic views, so generally prevalent; but his conclusions are revolting to the Christian consciousness, and they met with the stern rebuke of the best men of Germany at the time they were published. That would be just as bad as the absorption of the State by the Church, as it was attempted at times during the middle ages. It would be negative Protestantism carried out to its legitimate result. He thinks that in this way he furnishes the best vindication of the Reformation, as well as a palliation for the subsequent eclipse which the idea of one holy, catholic church has since undergone, and comforts himself with the thought that the present confusion and division in Protestantism are necessary to prepare the way for a new order of things, when the State shall be regenerated, and subserve the interests of piety and religion more faithfully than it has been in the power of the Church to do. Most probably, unconsciously to himself, Rothe was influenced by the status of the Church around him, which has been in Germany more or less one of servitude to the State ever since the Reformation. If the State there controls education and cultus, why may it not go farther and assume to itself all the other prerogatives of the Church? Let it be granted, that the union of Church and State, as it exists in Europe, is in all respects in harmony with the Christian idea, and we do not see why Rothe's speculation should not be received as true, or, rather we might say, as a rigidly logical conclusion. If our surmise should be correct in regard to Rothe, it would follow that this same night-mare on the breast of the German Evangelical Church may have a paralyzing effect upon other distinguished German divines when they come to discuss the church-question.

With an equally keen analysis, but with much more force of

truth, Rothe disposes of the old Protestant distinction of a visible and invisible church, and shows that an invisible church is a contradiction of terms, a mere abstraction or fiction, in which Protestants, not without a basis of truth, took refuge, when hard pressed by their adversaries of the Church of Rome. In this he simply anticipates the conclusion at which Protestant theology most probably will arrive by and by. The distinction of an invisible church seems to be no longer of any use, and Protestantism has secured for itself other and better weapons of defence. The Church has an inner side, but it is always, whether Protestant or Catholic, visible.

In regard to the particular form, under which the Church should appear in history, neither Christ nor the Apostles have given us any definite information. It was not necessary that they should; it would no doubt have been deleterious and destructive to the work of redemption, had they done so. Had any definite form been prescribed that would have been in all respects adapted to the early ages of the Church, it might not have suited succeeding ages, when the circumstances were different and the free development of the Christian principle required other and different forms. Then would have followed petrifaction, stagnation, and death, the end of all systems of natural religion, which are the product of certain ages or eras. For a while they flourish, embody themselves in certain fixed institutions, and then die for the want of an innate power to continue the process of development. Christianity was not something local, nor was it designed for any particular age or century exclusively. It carried within it a new life for humanity at large, and could not be fully embodied by any age, race, or nationality. In this respect it differs from Judaism, which came from God through Moses as a perfect system of forms and ceremonies, carried out to the minutest detail, intended for the Jews and for the Jews only. There was as yet no divine human life for the world at large, merely forms, types, and shadows, that pointed like so many finger-boards to the new dispensation of life that was to arise in the future. Here minutiæ and detail were necessary, and essential; but when

Christianity, the new life of the world, came to light, it was in itself sufficient to provide for the details of its development subsequently. In Judaism the basis was the letter, pointing to the spirit; in Christianity the basis was the spirit, giving life to the letter. Christianity must, therefore, be first established in the world, so as to have a connecting link with history: then believers under the guidance of the Holy Ghost would be prepared to build up the Church in detail in harmony with its inward spirit. Accordingly, this was the main work of the Saviour and the apostles, whilst they were on earth, the laying of a suitable foundation for the great work that was to follow.

It must not, however, be supposed that they were indifferent to the regular establishment and organization of the Church in after times. They looked forward towards it as part and parcel of the work in which they were themselves engaged. Our Saviour, speaking of the Church at large says: Upon this rock, I will build My church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. He then gives Peter and the rest of the disciples power to act in the case; invests them with the power of the keys, of opening and closing the kingdom of heaven against men; and supplies them with all the means that were necessary to carry out the work. It could not be said that He founded His Church whilst He was on earth, but, as we shall see further on He fully prepared the way for its rise and progress. The disciples generally were filled with bright expectations of it as something that would soon come to pass. Just before the Saviour ascended up on high, they asked the question, whether He would at this time restore again the Kingdom to Israel. Their original conception of the Church, of course, was worldly, Judaistic, dim, and very inadequately defined. Images of worldly power and glory floated before their minds, and to them probably nothing more than the restoration of the old Jewish theocracy was the ultimate form which Christianity was to assume. But the words of the Saviour afterwards recurring to them, as well as the course of events in the progress of the truth, shook these gross conceptions, and prepared the way gradually for more rational and intelligent views of the subject. In no one

did the idea of the Church work so powerfully as in the apostle Paul. His success in building up independent congregations on heathen ground, enlarged his views of Christianity in its relations to the world, separated him from the theocratic views of the Jews, and showed him the necessity of an organization that should take up the Gentile as well as the Jewish world. Occupying a peculiarly Christian point of view, free from Judaizing tendencies and sympathies, the idea of the Church took strong hold of him; and it fell to his lot to work out this extremely difficult problem, for which, by his fervent, hopeful spirit, and clear Christian consciousness, he was also best adapted. "He did not arrive at this result," says Rothe, "in a way which would appear to us the most direct and easy. He does not, for instance, commence constructing his idea of the Christian Church with the thought of that internal, spiritual communion of Christians as such, as distinguished from that which is external, although the difference between the internal and external side of Christian communion was by no means absent from his mind (*Rom. xiv. 17*). So too, in general, he did not derive it from any kind of reflection upon the communion of Christians with one another, but from the *consciousness of their relation to Christ*. From this directly arose his consciousness of their relation to each other." P. 287.

The relation of believers to the Saviour was for the apostle a matter of conscious experience, a real vital union. As he could not think of Christ except as living, and therefore active, this living union appeared to him as a state of absolute dependence, an interpenetration of the soul of the one with that of the other: the Saviour as the animating principle, the believer the organ of His activity, of His redeeming function. Here in Him he found the source of all communion among His disciples; they stood in the same relation to Him, were animated by the same Christ, and were all His members or organs. With this homogeneity of life, they were organically bound together in their vital activities by a principle, which continually referred them back to the source of their unity. Thus together they constituted a single organism, in which they were all members of Christ. Their indi-

vidual differences or peculiarities, so far from interfering with their union with each other, became mutual points of attraction, which as a diversity of gifts with the same Spirit, tended to organize them more closely into a living unity. In this sense the totality of believers became the body of Christ, of which He is the head, they, the members. "What Paul here calls the body of Christ," says Rothe, "is the complex of believers, something in itself living and pervaded with the quickening Spirit of Christ, in that proportion in which it is the organ, through which He works in the world, so that believers are to Him what the body is to the soul, the organ by means of which He is active." The apostle gives expression to the same conception of the Church, in substance, by means of another image, the temple or house of God. This was not peculiar to him, but was familiar to the Jewish mind, and was also used by St. Peter. This image is perhaps not so expressive as the other; it teaches, that the Church is that peculiar form of humanity, in which God Himself is pleased to dwell; but, in the hand of St. Peter, it is so marshalled into service, as to be made to express fully his sense of the new life of believers under the conception of lively or living stones. "Here in both figures," says Rothe again, "we meet directly with the true salient point in the conception of the Christian Church; with precisely that moment in its evolution, which afterwards constituted the living, genuine germ of the Catholic Church, namely with the thought that in a definite human society or community, redemption became in a real way an historical potency, and that in it alone the Redeemer acquired and still retains an historical existence and an historical activity; or in the striking language of Möhler, that in a definite human society, and in that alone, the Word-made-flesh continues itself and the fact of the Incarnation constantly perpetuates itself."* P. 288, 289, 290.

* The reader will not fail to observe the substantial agreement of the thoughts here expressed, and those contained in Dr. Nevin's masterly exposition of the idea of the Church in his reply to Dr. Dorner, in a previous number. Dr. D. would hardly say, we presume, that Dr. Nevin's views of the Church find no point of connection at all with German theology, which as we understand, he does not do, although he repudiates them so far as his own is concerned.

Now if the idea of the Church grew out of the general, Christian life of believers, or as Rothe expresses it, "out of the consciousness of their relation to Christ," we are prepared to see how the Church took its rise and developed itself in the course of history. In the first place, it was necessary that the requisite power should be at hand, such as we have found already in the divine-human life of our Saviour; and in the next place, the means to make it available and to perpetuate it in the world. The latter, as we have said, Christ Himself prepared before He ascended up on high. These were few and simple. First of all it was necessary, that there should be some distinct act, by which men should be introduced into this new order of life, and made constituent elements of this new organization or society, and be identified as such as well as distinguished from the world on the outside. Hence *Baptism* was instituted. As individual men are introduced into the present, sinful order of human life by natural birth or descent, so they must needs be introduced into the kingdom of heaven by a new, spiritual birth, by baptism, a being born of water and the Spirit. To unfold this new life, to confirm, strengthen, and perpetuate it, another act was necessary; hence the institution of the *Lord's Supper*, in which the new-born have an opportunity to eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man, and so be made forevermore partakers of His theanthropic life. To perform these acts, to guide and direct the Church in its formation and subsequent progress, to speak the words of God, the gospel life, as He would have it spoken, and to hold up to view the power of the new life in their own persons, an order of men had to be appointed: hence the *Christian Ministry* was established. They were prepared for this work by the Saviour Himself during His life-time, endowed subsequently with all the graces necessary for their work by the gift of the Spirit, and officially invested with authority to guide and direct the Church by the power of the keys. Such were the simple conditions by which Christ prepared the way for the building up of His kingdom on earth. As in the human body, and in the more complicated organisms generally, there are certain vital parts, centres of distinct system^s,

harmoniously blended in one general system, such as the heart, the lungs, or the brain, so it must be in that more complicated organism of the Church. Here too there must also be vital points, centres of life and power, and these are found in the Ministry, the Word, and the Sacrament.

According to Rothe the church could not properly be said to take its rise until congregations had been organized in different places, which afterwards having been brought into outward as well as inward union, constituted the Church in the proper sense of the term. In this, however, he is corrected, and we think very properly, by Dr. Schaff, who very justly puts the Church first and the congregation second. "The whole system of Government," he says, "formed itself from above downward, from the general to the particle and not the contrary." Further, Dr. Schaff also considers the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost as the "birth of the Church," as the proper date of its origin. "It was the generative beginning of a vast series of workings and manifestations of God in history; the fountain of a river of life, which flows with unbroken current, through all time, till it merge in eternity." The Holy Ghost, who was the bond of union between Father and Son in the godhead from all eternity; who moved upon the face of the waters in the beginning, and inspired holy men of old from time to time as occasion required; who overshadowed the Virgin Mary, and became the bond of union connecting the human and divine natures in Christ; who descended upon Christ at His baptism in Jordan and abode with Him ever afterwards; this same Holy Ghost, who had not yet been revealed, because Christ had not been glorified, took up His permanent abode among believers, on the day of Pentecost, and became the bond of a living union between them and their Head forever afterwards. This event, therefore, may be properly called the birth-day of the Church, the era of its foundation, and the beginning of that stream of grace, which up to this point had been confined to the person of the Redeemer; but which now by this agency of the Spirit, was opened and poured out in multitudinous streams of blessings upon the world. It is true the Church

as thus constituted was not fully or completely organized, as it was afterwards. It might be said to have been simple and rudimental in its form; still it was the Church truly organized, and embodying in itself all the powers and possibilities of the widest, the grandest, and the most permanent organization, which the world has ever witnessed. It may be said to have never as yet been fully organized; it cannot be said to be, certainly at the present day, amidst the divisions and dissensions among Christians, which so sadly mar her unity and beauty.

On the day of Pentecost, the disciples were filled with the Holy Ghost to overflowing; they were united into one body, and made to stand out as something distinct from the mass of humanity around them. They were in common partakers of the same divine gifts, and stood in co-ordinate relation to their common Head; but it must not be supposed that there was in all respects a dead level of equality, that excluded all distinctions and differences. There was from the start a difference between those who were leaders and those who followed; between the apostles, and the people. This distinction was acknowledged not as something based on the superior knowledge or personal worth of the apostles, but on the divine appointment and the necessities of the case. There can be no organization among men without this distinction between those who lead or rule and those who are led. So it is in the state, where the ruler or magistrate comes uppermost by an inevitable necessity in all places and in all conditions of society; where it is repressed, it breaks out and authenticates itself in the monstrosity of lynch-law. The same necessity existed at the formation of the Church, and it has asserted itself ever since. The apostles, representing all the functions of the ministerial office, were clothed with authority by Christ Himself to rule and direct the affairs of the Church in accordance with His will, and the believers generally accorded to them this authority and pre-eminence, cheerfully as a matter of course. They were next to Christ a necessary and essential centre of unity alike for individuals and bodies of individuals, or congregations. They did not go before the Church, on the one hand, and like mechanics,

proceed to construct the new building, nor on the other hand, did they follow as the creatures of the Church, clothed by it with authority. They constituted next to Christ the first stone or foundation, upon which the whole superstructure was to rest (Eph. ii. 20), the central wave in this renewed form of humanity, around which the whole human family is destined to gather in concentric circles, ever widening until the pentecostal gift shall have reached the utmost limits of the race. Some quotations here from Dr. Schaff's great work on the Apostolic Church on the general subject which we are here considering, will no doubt be interesting to our readers. Speaking of the Apostles, he says, "They formed the tribunal of appeal, the supreme, all-sufficient authority, as the inspired interpreters of the divine economy of salvation; and to this day their writings, those records of the Christian revelation in its primitive purity and freshness, remain the infallible rule of faith and practice. So far as the doctrine is concerned the apostles could challenge for their teaching unconditional obedience; for the Spirit of God gave them mouth and wisdom, and spoke through them in an infallible manner; and it is not at all to be imagined, that they suffered themselves here to be corrected or interfered with in any point by the congregations, which in fact owed to them their very existence." "In view of this universal avocation, the apostles were not only evangelists for the whole unconverted world (Matt. xxviii. 20), but at the same time the living bonds and the personal representatives of the inward and outward unity of the churches already organized." "With all this comprehensive authority, however, with all their personal independence in their respective spheres, by virtue of which, Paul, for example, once even rebuked the distinguished apostle, Peter, much his superior in office, the apostles still regarded themselves always as a collegiate body, and exercised their power, as organic members of such a body and under a sense of responsibility to it." See pp. 514, 515. "We have already remarked that the ministerial office was originally one and the same with the apostolical. But as the Church outwardly and inwardly grew, the apostles found their sphere of labor so enlarged, that they

could no longer attend alone to all the duties of discipline and public worship, and were compelled to resort to a division of labor. In this way arose gradually, as the wants of the Church and the force of circumstances required, the several offices, which have their common root in the apostolate, and through it partake in various degrees of its divine origin, and its powers, its privileges and duties." P. 498. "The design of the Christian ministry is none other than that of the mission of Christ himself,—the redemption of the world from sin and error." The spiritual office, or the ministry, is the vehicle of the powers of divine grace; the appointed channel for conveying the blessings of the gospel to mankind; the organ through which the Holy Ghost acts upon the world, and gradually transforms it into the kingdom of God. It would be pleasant for us to quote more extensively from Dr. Schaff's admirable book; but time will not permit, and we can but refer our readers to the work itself, especially to the third book, which treats of Church Government.*

According to Dr. Schaff, and as we firmly believe, also according to the Bible, the apostolate was the primitive form of the ministry, the root out of which all others grew, whether it appears in the persons of Prophets, Evangelists, Presbyters,

* We have frequently had occasion to refer to it, and to study it for many years, and, it gives us pleasure, to say, always with profit and edification. It embodies all that is truly valuable in Neander's Training and Planting of the Church, and Rothe's great work without their blemishes. It exceeds them both in beauty of spirit, and, what is of much greater account, has a much more orthodox ring, and is also more biblical. It advocates also much higher views of the Church and the ministry, in which we feel a defect in both Neander and Rothe, especially the former. It is, therefore, with sincere pleasure we learn that, together with the author's History of the Ancient Church, it has met with so favorable a reception in Germany as well as in this country; it is equally well adapted to both hemispheres: in Germany it cannot but exert a beneficial influence; for, whilst German theologians may speculate on the idea of the Church, they seem to have no power to carry out their idea. Most probably it will providentially be left to such practical countries as England and the United States to do this for them. We would recommend the work to clergymen generally. As an introduction or key, to the volumes on Church History which follow, it will be found to be particularly valuable. To private Christians also, it is well adapted for the purpose of edification, and we think it should be in all Christian families. The Latin and Greek quotations need not be read; the body of the book is in the vernacular, and so transparent in style that all may understand it.

Deacons or Bishops. As in the beginning, so in all ages, the sacred office lies at the foundation of the Church, and it must have the power of perpetuating itself and of adapting itself to the wants of believers and the circumstances of the times. The particular form, by which it was conferred in the times of the apostles, as well as ever since, was by the laying on of hands, or *Ordination*. Thus Paul, referring to this function of the ministry, exhorts Timothy to lay hands suddenly on no man, and defines the qualifications of elders and deacons, so that he may ordain no persons, except such as are qualified for the office. He also exhorts his disciple not to neglect the gift which was given him by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery or college of elders (1 Tim. iv. 14). In another place (2 Tim. i. 6), referring no doubt to the same transaction, he includes himself among the presbytery that laid hands on him. Rothe sees in these passages nothing but the imputation of a charism, and not a standing institution of the Church; whilst Dr. Schaff looks at it differently, and, as we think more correctly, considers it ordination. "After the election," he says, pp. 502, 503, "followed the ordination, or the solemn induction into office by prayer, and the laying on of hands (a ceremony borrowed from Judaism, comp. Num. xxvii. 18), the *symbol and medium of the communication of the grace prayed for and necessary for the office*." "At all events the part taken by the presbyters can have been no mere empty ceremony, any more than the participation of the congregation in the choice of officers, but *presupposes a right and power lodged in their official character of conveying the necessary spiritual gift*."^{*}

* In emphasizing these passages, it is not our wish to commit Dr. Schaff to any particular view or theory of ordination. They are simply the free and untrammeled expression of his views of this solemn act as derived from the Bible itself. It must, however, be admitted that they contrast strongly with the views current in our days, and maintained by many distinguished theologians, Lutheran and Reformed during the post reformation period. See Herzog's Real Cyclopaedia, Art. Ordination. In the bloom of the R-reformation period, it had manifestly a much higher import than subsequently in the Protestant Church. Calvin, who may be considered good authority on this point, for all branches, of the Reformed Church at least, does not hesitate to call ordination a real sacrament of its own kind. "The imposition of hands," he says, "which is used at the introduction of the true pres-

With the ministry as its salient point, the Church commenced its growth and outward enlargement. From the start it was a perfect unity, a type of that future unity to which it is destined to attain, when it shall embrace the whole human family, as it embraced the first disciples at Jerusalem (Acts ii. 42-47). In order, however, that the pure and holy life which animated the first converts, might be extended, new arrangements had to be made. In the course of time the gospel spread from Jerusalem to all parts of the earth, and in order to preserve it in its purity, as well as to extend it, congregations were formed and organized, which served to mediate between it and the particular life of individuals. This trichotomy is a universal law. Every real existence or unity includes in it, genus, species, and individuals. So it is in a perfectly developed state, where municipalities take up its life and realize it in the life of individual citizens. So it must be also in the Church, which as a whole must externalize itself in communities or congregations, which serve as branches, to diffuse its general life through its membership out into the world. The congregation is in itself an organization, pervaded by a common life, but always in vital union with the Church as a whole, from which it derives its existence, and in union with which alone it can preserve a healthy state. The theory, that after the day of Pentecost, congregations sprang up in different parts of the world, self-subsistent and independent of each other, which were subsequently brought into external unity with each other, is contrary to the biblical account, and is ably refuted by Rothe (p. 192, § 26). As at Jerusalem, so elsewhere, they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship and in breaking of bread and prayers (Acts ii. 42). The tendency then, however, as in our days to such independency and selfishness was very great. The old antagonism between the Jew and Gentile was intense, and it was

byters and ministers of the Church into their office, I have no objection to consider as a sacrament; and, in the next place, it is declared by Paul to be not unnecessary nor useless, but a faithful symbol of spiritual grace. (1, Tim. iv. 14). I have not enumerated it as the third, among the sacraments, because it is not ordinary or common to all believers, but a special rite for a particular office. See his Institutes, Vol. ii. p. 626, edition published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication, Phila. 1844.

revolting to the natural feelings even of many Christian Jews, that the unclean Gentiles should stand on a footing of equality in the same communion with themselves. The spread of the gospel among the heathen was distasteful to them, and even Peter, upon whom it devolved to preach the gospel first to both Jew and Gentile (Acts x. ch.), was called to account by believers of the circumcision for holding communion with men uncircumcised. Paul, the apostle of the Gentiles, committed a still greater offence in their view by his activity in building up congregations out of heathen converts. He was regarded with suspicion, and his work in danger of being ignored by the Jewish Christians. A schismatrical tendency sprang up, and the danger of division in the Christian family was imminent. The difficulty, however, was healed for the time being by the Synod of Jerusalem (Acts xv.), where the Gentile congregations were recognized, their rights and privileges secured to them, and the outward unity of the apostolic Church fully asserted. But this antagonism, with its accompanying evils, was not destroyed. It continued to harass the Church for many years, and seemed to increase in violence as the Apostle was successful in spreading the gospel among the heathen, as may be seen from his frequent reference to it in his epistles. What was to be done in these circumstances? In our days it most probably would have resulted in a division of the Christian family. Not so, however, in the earliest and purest age of the Church. The apostles here were of one mind on this point, and working together with great forbearance for human infirmity, they maintained the unity of the Church intact. Whilst the apostle John, with his doctrine of divine life and love must have exerted a silent, harmonizing influence among the congregations, the apostle Paul made use of more practical means to secure the same object. With him it was a matter of vital importance, that the Gentile churches should be acknowledged by the mother-church at Jerusalem, and stand in Christian communion with her. Accordingly, we find that he makes a journey to Jerusalem for this purpose, although he was dissuaded from doing so all along his journey, on account of its extremely perilous character. The outward occasion for this visit was the large collection, which had been

gathered for the poor saints at Jerusalem in Macedonia and Greece; the inward motive was the earnest desire that, with this plentiful supply for their bodily wants, he might show the brethren at Jerusalem the practical fruits of the gospel among the Greek Christians, their grateful love and pious zeal, and so knit together more firmly the two grand divisions of the Church. The perfect healing of the inward schism, which threatened to result in permanent separation and alienation among believers, must have appeared to him, with his conception of the Church, as the body of Christ, to be in itself worth any personal sacrifice of feeling he might make or any extreme peril he might incur (*Acts xxi. ch.*). He was "bound in spirit" to go up to Jerusalem, in which, in addition to his own sense of duty, he recognized the higher impulse of the Holy Ghost, which constrained him in this crisis to throw himself into the breach, in order to save the interests of Christianity, though he incurred the risk of losing his life. As on another occasion, he went up to Jerusalem to attend the council, bearing alms to his nation, so it was doubtless at this time, *lest he should run, or had run, in vain* (*Gal. ii. 2*); that is, that he and his Gentile congregations might be kept within the communion of saints, and that the whole Church might be one. So mighty did the principle of unity and catholicity work in the Apostolic Church.

But while the Church as a whole moved onwards towards unity, outward as well as inward, the same principle was at work also in the organization of single congregations. There was here Christian equality, but only in such a sense that whilst there was entire freedom in divine worship, often resulting in disorder and confusion, the ministerial office, as modified by circumstances, and the necessity of the case, was still the basis of each one of these subordinate organizations, and the means under God of their preservation in the unity of the faith, and of all growth and enlargement. Time, however, will not permit us at this time, to speak of the process of their internal organization in detail, nor of other developments of the Church at large as it passed from the hands of the apostles and pursued its onward course in history. Enough has been said to show

that Christianity and the Church are inseparable; that the one cannot be understood without a clear conception of the other; and that the divine human-life of our Redeemer has found a lodgment in the heart of humanity in an outward, objective, form of its own creation. In a subsequent article we shall resume the subject, and endeavor to trace out somewhat further the new stream of history, which took its start in the God-man.

ART. IV.—“TOUCH ME NOT; FOR I AM NOT YET ASCENDED
TO MY FATHER.”

BY REV. WALTER E. KREBS, ALLEGHENY CITY, PA.

MARY MAGDALENE had the honor of being the first of mortals to see the Saviour of the world after His resurrection from the dead. That He, who arose as conqueror of the devil, appeared first to her, out of whom He had cast seven demons, is a fact worthy of notice; it is remarked by the Holy Scriptures themselves (Mark xvi. 9). Her language to Jesus, whom she mistook for the gardener, was childlike and earnest. “Sir, if thou have borne Him hence, tell me where thou hast laid Him, and I will take Him away.” A thrill of astonishment mingled with joy must have penetrated her inmost being as she heard Him, in His own peculiar tone, speak her name. “Mary!” Immediately turning and looking full upon Him, with the exclamation “My Master;” it is natural to suppose that she started at once to embrace His sacred person, whereupon He uttered the profound words, “*Touch Me not; for I am not yet ascended to My Father.*”

On entering into an examination of this divine utterance, it is necessary first of all to be reminded, that no alteration of the received text is at all admissible. The critical authorities, it seems, are unanimously on the side of the usual reading. The conjectures of certain commentators, who propose other readings as possibly the original, are merely conjectures, and nothing more. The words in the text stand there by inspiration.

The interpretations that have been given are many and various. Only the principal of these can we here consider. And as each one comes into consideration, it will be necessary to keep in mind that, to prove at all satisfactory, it must on the one hand attach a legitimate meaning to the word "touch," and on the other make due account of the ascension, showing how the as yet unaccomplished ascension could be a reason or cause to render the touch at the time improper or impossible. So much is demanded by the very form of words employed by the Saviour.

Take the view, which some have advanced, that her touch was intended to excite or confirm her faith in the reality of His resurrection. How could His non-ascension be assigned as a reason why she could not touch Him for that purpose? To show some connection with His ascension, we might indeed suppose, as Meyer does, that Mary was uncertain whether the Saviour stood before her with a *material* body, or having just returned from the Father to whom He had ascended, with a *spiritual* body; and that He forbid her touch, inasmuch as He could assure her by His words simply that He had not yet ascended, and consequently had not the spiritual body she supposed He might have. But if this had been her object, it could not be satisfactorily explained why Thomas, with a similar design, was directed to do the very thing with respect to which Mary was resisted. "Reach hither thy finger, and behold My hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into My side; and be not faithless but believing." It will not do to say that Mary was believing, and Thomas skeptical, for greater would be the reason why the former should be gratified rather than the latter. And besides, not only Thomas, but the rest of the eleven were invited to touch Him to assure themselves that He was not "spirit," but "flesh and bones" (Luke xxiv. 37-43). "Behold My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself: *handle Me and see*; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see Me have."

Nor can we take the word "touch" here in the sense of "worship," as is the interpretation of others, as if the Saviour had said, "Do not worship Me now in My present condition,

but wait until it is proper for you to do so when I am ascended and exalted." In this view, due account is made of the ascension, but a forced interpretation is put upon the word "touch."

It is nowhere else used in such a sense. Moreover, worship offered to Him before His ascension He did not forbid. Even before His death and resurrection, He was worshiped, as by the man born blind (John ix. 38.), by the mother of Zebedee's children, (Matt. xx. 20), and others. Not many minutes after He had said to Mary, "Touch Me not," He showed Himself to the other women as they were returning from the tomb, and they *held Him by the feet and worshiped Him*. The eleven too, when they met Him on the appointed mountain in Galilee, *worshiped Him* (Matt. xxviii. 9, 17). In every instance the same word is used by which *divine* worship is denoted. Why should He deny to Mary what He permitted in the case of the other women, and of the eleven?

Closely allied to this is the following view. "Do not cling to My earthly appearance, and expect that the former intimacy can still subsist between us. For though I am not yet ascended, I soon will be, in which exalted state all such intimacy with you in your yet fallen state will be precluded." Now it is true that the relation existing between Christ and His disciples after His ascension was different in form and character from that before, but that it was less cordial and intimate, we have positive scriptural warrant, as we shall afterwards see, to deny. This objection is here formally made apparent by the necessity of supplying the arbitrary phrase "soon will be." The words, "To My Father, and your Father; to My God, and your God," as Olshausen justly observes, "express the idea of an *approximation* of the disciples to the person of Christ."

Perhaps the most common and popular interpretation is, in brief terms, the following. "Do not consume any time now in touching Me, for I am not yet ascended, and before I do ascend you will have many opportunities of so doing, but go now without delay and tell My disciples that I am risen from the dead." So, in substance, Doddridge, Bengel, and others. Now it is to be observed that the message which Mary was directed to bear had reference, not to His *resurrection*, but to His *ascension*.

She had already communicated to Peter and John the fact that His body was not in the sepulchre, who, having run thither to see for themselves, had departed again, believing in His resurrection. And this view is objectionable, just because it makes so little account of the *ascension* as distinguished from the resurrection. According to it, the only reason why He mentions the ascension at all is to show Mary that she had plenty of time for her touching. This seems almost trivial. It is by no means compatible with the fact that the Saviour, not only assigns His *non-ascension* as the reason why she should not or could not touch Him, but also in immediate connection makes His *ascension* the subject of a direct message to His disciples. Having yet forty days, as we know, before His ascension, why such haste was necessary to communicate this message as not to allow Mary the few moments requisite for touching Him, whatever may have been her purpose, is a question that would remain to be answered. The other women were permitted to hold Him by the feet and worship Him, before the communication of *their* message (Matt. xxviii. 10); why should not Mary be permitted to touch Him, before the communication of *hers*?

The interpretation proposed by Schleiermacher, and seconded by Olshausen is, that He did not wish to be touched as His risen life was new to Him, and being fearful and susceptible, was anxious to avoid everything that might in any way interfere with that process through which He was passing from His resurrection to His ascension. No doubt it is true that there was a process of this kind, and that He came gradually to the full apprehension or experience of His resurrection life, but what reason have we to suppose that this could have been in any way interfered with or interrupted by Mary's touch? Olshausen himself confesses that he is by no means insensible to the singularity of the thought. If that were the state of His body, why did He *invite* the touch of Thomas? And even if we suppose that his touch was so long a time after, that He could now endure it, we cannot in the same way get rid of the touch of the other women which happened *immediately* after this manifestation to Mary. In the case both of these women and of Thomas,

as well as in that of Mary, He could have said, as far as His resurrection body was concerned, "*I am not yet ascended, therefore touch Me not.*"

In the positive consideration of these interesting words, after this brief review of various interpretations, it may be laid down as truths clearly established or plainly implied in the language itself, that Mary's attempted touch was different altogether in purpose and design from that of the other women and of Thomas, and that as such it could be realized not before, but only after, His ascension to the Father. What that purpose or design was is now to be determined. It may be true indeed that more was involved in her own action, and deeper was the meaning of the Saviour's reply, than she was able at the time to comprehend. This was frequently the case in regard both to what Christ said to His disciples, and what they did towards Him. "When therefore He was risen from the dead, His disciples remembered that He had said this unto them." "These things understood not His disciples at the first; but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of Him, and that they had done these things unto Him." Nevertheless Mary must have had her own particular object in view when she attempted to touch Him. What this object was, we have some clear scriptural facts to enable us in a great measure to determine.

The few things recorded of Mary Magdalene in the Holy Scriptures are enough to lead us to suppose that she was greatly attached to the person of our Lord. Actual contact with the object of love is the method by which that attachment is ordinarily exhibited or gratified. This was no doubt the primary motive of her attempted touch. So Mary, the sister of Lazarus, exhibited her overflowing feelings of gratitude for the restoration of her brother, by pouring upon His head and feet the pound of costly ointment of spikenard. So also the woman, who was a sinner, no doubt in thankful love for some great benefit received, "stood at His feet behind Him weeping, and began to wash His feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed His feet, and anointed them with

the ointment" (Luke vii. 38). Tradition makes this woman to be *Mary Magdalene*, the very subject of our consideration, on which account the early church appointed this gospel for her memorial. But whether it were Mary or not, both these interesting incidents show how woman exhibits her feeling towards the person of one by whom she has been befriended, or whom she loves. *Mary Magdalene* had been wonderfully benefited by Jesus. And she was the first of the women, who had prepared spices and ointments, to arrive at the tomb, in order to *anoint His body*. She came "early, when it was yet dark," (John xx. 1); the others not until "the rising of the sun." (Mark xvi. 2). She alone remained, when all others had gone, and was found weeping. Jesus honored her devotion and tears by manifesting Himself first to her in His risen state. "Woman, why weepest thou?" Her reply shows how greatly her love longed to pour itself even upon His lifeless body. Thinking she was addressing the gardener, "Sir, if thou have borne Him hence, tell me where thou hast laid Him, *and I will take Him away.*" With all these circumstances before us, what can we suppose would be the first impulse of so loving a nature, when she suddenly became conscious of its divine object standing alive before her, but to come near almost with a bound and embrace His sacred person.

In addition to this, we know also from the gospel narratives how wonderful an effect a simple touching of Jesus had upon the bodies of those who were diseased or possessed of devils. "As many as touched Him were made perfectly whole." That a blessing was imparted through bodily contact was clearly the belief of those women who brought their infants to the Saviour that He might *touch* them (Luke xviii. 15). The case of the woman with an issue of blood is remarkable. "If I may touch but His clothes, I shall be whole." She touched, and Jesus immediately perceived that "*virtue had gone out of Him.*" This is significant language! Healing power had been communicated from Christ to the woman immediately on her touch! "*Straightway* the fountain of her blood was dried up, and she felt in her body that she was healed of that plague." He

could indeed, and actually did, cure many, simply by His word and at a distance, but in some way or other the people had the idea that actual contact was the regular way. "They besought Him that they might touch if it were but the border of His garment." "They bring a blind man unto Him, and besought Him to touch him." Mary Magdalene herself was of the number of those women who had been healed by Him of evil spirits and infirmities (Luke viii. 2). He had cast out of her seven demons. In what way her cure was effected, we are not informed. But having been the recipient of His healing power, and, in common with the people, familiar at least with the fact that that power could be communicated by a simple touch, it is quite natural to suppose that she may have had lurking in her mind an idea that new power or virtue would be communicated by touching the Saviour in His new resurrection state.

In view of these facts we are justly led to believe that Mary attempted to touch or come into contact with the Saviour as an effect of, or for the sake of gratifying, her pure love, coupled perhaps with a vague notion that new life or power might be thereby imparted. But whether this latter idea was or was not in the mind of *Mary*, so far as *Christ* Himself was concerned, we have too many of His profound words, if we take only those recorded by St. John (who alone records the profound incident before us), as to leave any room for doubt that in *His* mind at least, was present the idea of *spiritual real contact with His person by the communication of His life through the operation of the Holy Ghost*. And if this idea were neither fully nor faintly in the mind of Mary, His reply was intended either to implant it there, or bring it into clear apprehension. And further, if at the time she was unable fully to comprehend His language, no doubt after the ascension, and the touching that thereupon followed, she was then in a condition to perceive it in all the force and beauty of a promise fulfilled. The Saviour was in the habit of leading the minds of His disciples from common and natural things and occurrences to those that were supernatural and spiritual, and to proclaim truths necessarily dark to be made clear only after the outpouring of the Holy Ghost.

The expression, "For I am not yet ascended," can imply only one of two things; either that the touching, which was not permitted just at that moment, would be permitted at some future time *before* His ascension; or that the touching which was not possible before, would be possible *after* His ascension. The former is excluded by the fact, as was previously observed, that the only reason of the prohibition would be the loss of a little time that would ensue, which seems almost trivial. The language is, not "*I will not* ascend for awhile," but "*I am not yet* ascended." The only alternative is, that what she attempted to do could be done in any real way only *after* His ascension. We, therefore, knowing what transpired after His ascension, can now look back, as no doubt Mary herself also afterwards did, and comprehend the full meaning of words so mysterious when uttered.

What now was it that so transpired? Nothing less than the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, the eleventh day after His ascension to the Father. Why did the Holy Ghost thus come? For the purpose of bringing to individuals the salvation of Christ, and building them as lively stones upon Him the foundation. With *His* coming the Saviour Himself returned, in a different but no less real form.* The difference may be thus expressed. In His previous state He was separate and alone, like a grain of corn before it is hid in the ground; but in His after state, He "saw His seed, and of the travail of His soul" (*Isaiah liii.*) by the real communication of His salvation through the Spirit to others, who, as grains of corn like unto Himself, came into existence, spring-

* "He had promised the disciples that, after ascending to the Father, He would return and remain with them forever. Now He had returned; and they might deem this to be the return which He had promised, and expect Him to remain with them thenceforth in the same form. He cautions them against so misunderstanding the promise as to cleave to Him in the form in which He then appeared, because He had 'not yet ascended to the Father.' After that event, when He should manifest Himself as the glorified one, were they to embrace Him wholly; obviously not in a natural, but in a spiritual sense. His stay in His then form was to be but transient; only after His ascension could He remain permanently, and that in another form."—*Neander's Life of Christ.*

ing up from His life. All this was possible only after His glorification (John xii. 23, 24). Not touching Him outwardly in the flesh, but touching Him inwardly by the implantation of His life in the centre of our being was the object of His incarnation. So also St. Paul says, "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more" (2 Cor. v. 16). Those who would show Him outward devotion, He always pointed to a higher union and communion. Martha exhibited her attachment by preparing for His bodily wants an excellent supper, but her sister Mary, who sat at His feet to hear His words, was preferred, and alone commended. The difference is observable too in the promise which He gave them, while He was yet visibly present, that He and His Father would come at some future time and make their abode with them (John xiv. 23). And what is apparently more contradictory still, while He was in the very act of disappearing from their gaze, the last accents that fell upon their ears as He went up, were, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The union between Himself and disciples was at first one of sympathy, of love, and outward association, but afterwards it was one of life, like that between the vine and the branches, the head and the members. The former fellowship, which they so much enjoyed, they had to learn to give up, in order to enjoy the latter. The latter was not possible until Jesus was glorified and the Holy Ghost given (John vii. 39). It was expedient for them that Christ should go away, for only then could the Spirit come (xvi. 7). Only then was the power given them to become the sons of God, and did they receive of His fullness (i. 12, 16); only then was the water given them to be a well of water springing up into everlasting life (iv. 14); only then could they come unto Him, to whom the Father had given to have life in Himself, that they might receive of that life (v. 26-40); only then could they eat His flesh, and drink His blood (vi. 62, 63). The Holy Spirit was to come, after His ascension, in order to quicken, to be a Comforter that should abide in them forever, but not to work in them independently or *de novo*, as if the foundation had not been laid, the vine not

planted, the fountain not established. His work was, not thus to set aside the Son, but to glorify Him; to take of the things of Jesus and show them unto His people; to comfort them, who were sad at parting, not by assuring them of His eternal separation, but by media'ing His glorious spiritual presence.

With such scriptural truths before us, it is not hard to arrive at the full import of our Saviour's words to Mary, "Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended." Make no attempt to attain to that contact with Me, which will be possible only after My ascension and consequent outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

But it is to be further noted, that after refusing her touch at the present, and impliedly promising her this privilege in the future, He directed her to communicate the fact of His *ascension* to the *disciples*. This implies that *they* at least, calling to mind some previous instruction, would have clearer views of all that was involved for them in that glorious act, and what kind of touching would be thereafter possible. It remains for us to look at these instructions, as many as are recorded, and learn the lesson of the disciples.

The night immediately preceding His crucifixion He said unto them, "A little while," *i. e.* from this time to the cross, and then "ye shall not see Me, and again a little while," *i. e.* from His burial to His resurrection, as we might at first suppose, and then "ye shall see Me." But this "seeing Him again," even if He had not added another word, could not be taken to refer simply to the mere occasional glimpses which they had of Him during the forty days, as *they* would hardly have made up for that constant intercourse which they previously enjoyed, and been able to turn their sorrow into joy (John xvi. 22). But the matter is put beyond all doubt by His adding the significant words, "*Because I go to the Father.*" Their seeing of Him to their joy, involving as this does His presence by the Holy Ghost, was to be a consequence of His going to the Father. Hence the disciples could understand, to a greater extent than Mary, the words He addressed to her, and the message He sent to them: "Touch Me not, for I am not yet ascended *to my Father*; but go to My brethren, and say unto *them*, I ascend to My Father and to your Father; and to My God, and your God."

On the same solemn occasion He also said, "At that day ye shall know that I am in My Father, and ye in Me, and I in you" (xiv. 20). "Ye in Me, and I in you" signifies the closest personal union, the most vital *contact*, conceivable. When was that to be known as a reality? "At that day." This clearly means, not the day of their death, or the judgment day, but the day of Pentecost.* For of no other day could He say, "Yet a little while, and the world seeth Me no more; but ye see Me; because I live, ye shall live also" (verse 19). Not at the day of their death certainly, nor at the day of judgment could it be said that they and not the world would see Him, that they would live because He lives—but on the day when the Spirit came, and He Himself returned in a higher form, according to His promise, "I will not leave you comfortless; I will come to you" (verse 18). Now this promise follows immediately in connection with the promise of the Spirit (verses 16 and 17), and as a consequence of going to His Father (verse 12). All these things, His going to the Father, the coming of the Spirit, His own coming, and their living contact with Him, follow each other in a succession so regular and connected, that they could not help but be reminded of them, and be able to understand them better, when Mary came with the information that she had seen the Lord, that He had refused her touch because He had not yet ascended, and that He had directed her to tell them of His going to His God and Father, who was also theirs (xx. 18).

Nor is this the only reference to this subject in these last discourses of Christ to His disciples. They are full of such references. Not only does He repeatedly tell them that He is soon going to His Father, but He also reveals at the same time the benefits that would thereby accrue to them. We may appropriately conclude our discussion by quoting the words recorded in the sixteenth chapter, than which nothing could be plainer or more directly to the point. "Now I go My way to

* "The true knowledge of Him and of the Father was not connected with the corporeal resurrection of Christ, but with the outpouring of the Spirit in which Christ communicated life to His people, and in it the Divine essence which is accompanied by the true knowledge."—*Kendrick's Olshausen's Commentary*, Vol. II. p. 561.

Him that sent me," and as if to reprove them gently for having no appreciation, on account of their sadness, of what He had said, He continued, "and none of you asketh me, Whither goest Thou? But because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your heart. Nevertheless I tell you the truth. It is *expedient for you* that I go away, for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you. When He, the Spirit of truth is come, He will guide you into all truth. He shall glorify Me; for *he shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you.* All things that the Father hath are Mine: therefore said I, that He shall take of *Mine*, and shall shew it unto you." On these last words, in reference to any distinction that might be made between the *showing* of truth and the *communication* of life, Olshausen makes the following just and forcible comment. "The only correct view of the words is that according to which, in the relations of Father, Son, and Spirit, no distinction whatever is made between *knowledge* and *essence*; the Divine essence itself is knowledge, and since the Son receives *knowledge* from the Father, He receives also *essence*, and so again the Spirit in like manner. And, as the Father glorifies the Son, and the Son again the Father, so the Holy Spirit also glorifies the Son, viz., not in Himself, but in the whole community of believers, the Church, wherein the life of Christ is manifested, which the Spirit brings to perfection."

Prepared and fortified as they were with such instructions, it would be the most difficult thing for us to explain, how the disciples could misinterpret or fail to understand the news and message of Mary. It is as if He had said: "You wish to touch Me, to come near to the object of your love, perhaps with some secret hope that by such contact with My risen body new grace or life may be communicated as you once experienced from Me in My previous state—your wish is a proper one and shall be gratified, in a more inward and real way, however, than you have any conception of at present—but this can come to pass only by the operation of the Holy Ghost, after My glorification at the right hand of the Father. Go tell My disciples, whom I

shall then call *brethren*—they are no doubt better prepared to understand My meaning—that I am now about to ascend, as I told them, unto Him, who as He is My Father and My God will by the communication of My life through the Spirit, also become their Father and their God."

AET. V.—PSYCHOLOGICO-MORAL REMARKS WITH REFERENCE TO THE HISTORY AND DOCTRINE OF THE FALL.

BY DR. K. H. SACK.

Translated by Rev. J. B. Kerschner, Mercersburg, Pa.

It has been said on various sides, that the Biblical history of the Fall is repeated in every man, and that this is a proof of its truth. Sensuality and pride, it is said, are still the two chief incitements to sin; and if Scholastic Theologians have disputed as to whether Adam's sin was *gula* or *superbia*, those who have maintained the one or the other, have had to acknowledge that the one is frequently found connected with the other. Indeed, neither the truth of the biblical narrative, nor the origin of sin in the first pair, can be sufficiently apprehended from such remarks; for that which takes place in us their descendants, is always in so far different as we are ever born with an inclination to unrighteousness, which is sin, so that every temptation to lust or pride coming from without, is always attached to an inner propensity—which was not the case with our first parents, and could not be, unless we are willing to make God the author of sin, which according to sound Theistical Conceptions must be absolutely guarded against. Nevertheless no acute thinker will regard the analogy between that which occurs in the soul of the grown man, as well as of the child, and the traditions with reference to the first sin, as insignificant, *i. e.* unimportant for understanding of the third chapter of Genesis. And if it could be shown that the psychological reflection on the temptation to transgress the Divine command and law, could be con-

tinued farther, be more sharply apprehended or more deeply known, it would not be too bold to suppose that the knowledge, of the biblical record would be enlarged, and confidence in its truth would thus, to a certain degree, be strengthened.

The following remarks are an effort to apprehend more in their unity than has yet been the case so far as I know, the elements of the sinful incitement, as they are continually found in the soul of every sinful man, without regard to the greater or less magnitude of the particular outward manifestations of sin.

1. The statement that sin is nothing but excessive sensuousness which has won the preponderance over the reason, must be denied even on the ground of every more thorough experience. Not only in adults is every sensuous transgression joined with self-elevation, pride, and hate, but even in children the sensual self-will is connected with at least a minimum of those super-sensuous motions against the law and the idea of the good: obstinacy and defiance lie concealed in sensual desires; as then these show themselves often of less power, than the impulse to do that which is forbidden, simply *because* it is forbidden. Whence now comes this admixture of pride and self-elevation with sins of sense, since this inordinate sensuousness even presupposed, of its own nature, seems to lead to the doing of evil, and since it, *per se*, does not seem to be self-exaltation at all, but rather self-degradation to a degree that awakens the reproaches of conscience? To this we answer, that in every sin of sense there lies essentially and originally an incentive to *knowledge*, a wish to experience, to test how it really is with the sensual transgression of the Moral Law, what will come of it, and whether it is really true that evil consequences are to be expected from it for soul and body. This temptation to knowledge is always a wish to know about the good and the bad, under the supposed possibility that the forbidden sensuous evil is after all no evil, but something good, only another kind of the good which the law forbids. In this the supposition is implied too that the good forbidden is itself perhaps a kind of bad, or in other words, good and bad in the province of sensuous transac-

tions, are not at all essentially different ; at least that it is worth the effort to become acquainted with the prohibited sensual by experience, whether it may not be good after all, and thus unjustly withheld. This stimulus of the desire of knowledge which can be traced ever into the apparently most minute as well as in the greatest sensuous transgressions, is *per se* already essentially pride, self-elevation, self-exaltation above the law given us by God, or some being standing above us, and revealing itself through our conscience—is an effort to be independent through knowledge, empirically and intellectually. The more inexperienced man is of God and the good, the more ignorant and childish the sensually sinning man is, the less is the sin of yielding to this thirst for knowledge. The more developed the thinking, knowing and judgment of a man is, the greater is the sin of sense ; but in both cases it is in its essence both pride, and a striving for independence. The sin of the ripened man on the side of sensuality commonly is plainly defiance and pride. The evil incitement to knowledge in the child in its sensual transgressions is rather curiosity, impertinence, and at the same time, a moving of the power of thought, still always self-exaltation. A sin of sense without an impulse to knowledge, on the part of a sound-minded man, cannot be conceived of.

2. If now on the other hand we inquire into the nature of sins of self-exaltation, often revealing itself in sins which seem to be entirely isolated, we shall find them to be confessedly not only a presumptuous thinking of the subject of itself and things, a haughty self-consciousness, and in so far the satisfying of an impure thirst for knowledge (for not even an external deed of violence can be perpetrated without such an inner self-exaltation), but also (and this is important here) always essentially and originally sinful sensuality and *desire of pleasure*. For from every thought of himself and the world, which man effects *outside of the life in God*, freeing himself from the moral necessity of thinking God and His law at the same time and pre-eminently a necessity revealing itself more and less powerfully in every human being—he promises a feeling, an enjoyment of self, which, no difference how abstract this thinking of the

world and self may be, is always of a sensuous kind; for the spiritual power of man, his entire thinking, is surrounded and borne by his psychico-somatic individuality. But now the selfish disorderly tension of any one side of the human self-feeling brings the other also into a morbid excitement, has its very origin in the corrupt root, the injured centre of the human nature; and thus the false thinking of the proud man is always at the same time sensual pleasure, either of a more refined or coarser kind. This explains on the one hand, how a proud thinking of one's self is generally connected with vanity, which, however refined, is a sensual pleasure in the trivial things of life; on the other, how men of great powers of thinking, when exercised in self-glorification, often manifest a defiant confidence in their physical strength, and not seldom are inclined to sensual excesses, as the biographies of so many men of genius in the sphere of art, and in revolutionary ages, plainly teach us. Is there not also in social life, so far as it is not supported by religious morality, in circles of unsanctified talent, a spiritual revelry in which the sensuo-sinful element is cherished, however refined or covered up? Thus the sins of sense are not only always connected with the sin of lofty thought, but exist essentially in this. And this is true of abstract thinking when it is presumptuous, as well as of empirical and practical judgment, when the objects of such judgment are looked at without pure selfishness, with more or less arbitrary subjective presuppositions, prejudice or deceptive imagination. From this also follows that every presumptuous attempt to know (*wissen wollen*), as it is, *per se*, unjust and sinful, because it is a tearing ourselves loose from life and thinking in God, and from the good of His law; involves in it a tendency to such a knowledge of evil, as places it, (the evil) on the same footing with the good; the idea being entertained that it is not really bad, or at least not absolutely bad, but only somehow less good than the opposite good: and that this good itself is, to a certain extent, also evil, because, like it, it may result in evil. This also explains the fact that the most presumptuous and irreligious forms of the attempt to know (*wissen wollen*), absolute Pantheism, and sys-

tematically consistent Materialism, involve the proposition of the identity of good and evil.

3. The psychological consideration of sin, as it still daily reveals itself in the human soul, gives from both sides, sense and pride, the same result, viz., that sensuality and self-exaltation are not accidentally or successively connected, but that they are originally and essentially *one*, *one* sin, *one* injustice, *one* hostility to God, which comes to light in one more as sensual degradation, in another more as presumptuous self-elevation, according to the individual disposition (*anlage*) of each man, also the temptation which meets him from without. What is then the point common to both, and how is it to be characterized? It is a false conception, an untruthful thought, an ungodly self-willing, by means of a fancy: that is the common root of every transgression of the Divine will, brought either internally or externally into the consciousness of the human soul. How such a conception, such a perverted thinking, this ungodly motion of the will (for every act of thinking participates in a motion of the will, even if it be only permitting an impression upon our five senses), ever came into man,—this can never be explained through an empirically observed impression made by the external world upon the soul. For the material world offers no temptation to sinful thoughts unless the tinder is already in the soul. The seduction of one man by another presupposes evil already present in the human species, thus only puts off the question. The fact that all men are, through their descent from father and mother, found to be infected with such false conception, with untruth, with lie and sin, in the widest meaning of the word, though it be as the unavoidability of a minimum, necessarily points not only the theological, but also philosophical thinker, back to the first sin of man, *i. e.* the sin of the first man. But as we are not only unable to know any thing about this by observation, but also because the case is different (from that of men born with sinful infirmity) on account of the innocence necessarily assumed (at least by theists and Theologians) of the first man, a going back to the Biblical tradition of the fall depends on the following

points :—1. In how far the features of the relations of the first men are analogous to that which takes place in men born in sin. 2. If such analogy must be acknowledged, to what degree the narrative, apart from the similarity of the temptations which happen to us, would become thereby incredible.

In the following we will endeavor to look more closely at these questions in close connection with what we have just found to be true.

1. The state of the first men can be thought of only as perfect innocence within their innate consciousness of God as the good Creator and Lord of them and the surrounding nature: Innocence, which had a consciousness of the possibility and duty of attaining, through continual living and remaining in God and His will, to an ever progressive knowledge of Him, as well as to an increasing enjoyment of every pleasurable thing. In accordance with this condition, there existed for the first men a satisfying unity of their knowledge of God, themselves and nature, and of their joy in God, themselves and nature. No antithesis between the natural and the supernatural existed for them, because nature in all its parts reflected back to them the kindness and wisdom of God. Their knowledge of the ethically good was a knowledge of their personal abiding in God's will; they knew about evil only as the divinely appointed limit of their activity; and this limit, drawn by a prohibition, could seem to them only good, because it came from the author of all the good surrounding them. To think this limit, was nothing bad, it was rather an exercise of their abiding in God in thought, feeling and will. The condition of the first man is designated in a way two-foldly false (1), when he is represented as possessing perfect wisdom and righteousness, as we find in Christ, considering Him merely as a man, or as we may think these to exist in a man when quite purified and morally perfected by grace. Such a condition would be in contradiction to the purposes of the Divine love, to lead man through self-activity into the full likeness of God. Nor would a fall from such a condition be conceivable. (2) But also an absolute equalization of the first human pair with chil-

dren, original sin being left out of consideration, cannot be the correct conception of them, for they had within themselves a knowledge of the being, dominion and love of God, not through reflection, but through immediate life, and at the same time possessed the ability to so rule over nature, under God, as well as the capacity for this insight into things; nothing of all this is found or can be found in the most innocent children. The first men knew enough to be able to act properly and in communion with God, and they knew of evil only thus, that it was the possibility of an activity through which they would cease to be in God, in which their joy consisted.

Now how did it happen that this human pair could and did forsake this condition? The Bible says, It happened through the temptation of the evil spirit who enticed them to a twofold sin, absolutely united into one, to the pleasure of sensual enjoyment, which had been forbidden them, and to the attainment of a knowledge like that of God. (Gen. iii. 5, 6).* Only the two together, as proceeding from the one forbidden act, could constitute a temptation for the first men. Not to sensual enjoyment *per se*, for in the fullness of that granted them to enjoy, and to be enjoyed in accordance with the will of God, a particular thing could afford no other temptation, than just through their ignorance why it was forbidden, thus through the expectation of a knowledge which would render them independent. A mere presumptuous longing to know more than they would experience and know in a progressive walk with God, alone could not come into their souls, for their knowledge of God, and of things as

* Luther's translation of v. 6, followed by Meyer and Stier (also by the Eng. Vul.) "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, dafs es ein lustiger Baum wäre weil er klug mach te" (*because it made one wise*) is to be decidedly preferred to that of De Wette, "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, und der Baum lieblich anzuschauen war" (*and the tree was pleasant to behold*); partly because the 2d and 3d members of that which is designated as being perceived by the woman would be, (according to De Wette's translation) perfectly tautological, partly because the Hiphil of ^{רָכַב} with the causative meaning of "to make wise" occurs in several passages. Also the connection between v. 5, and even v. 11, and the question how Adam knew that he was naked, leads clearly to the meaning, "to make wise."

being in Him, stood in the most satisfying relation and equilibrium with the extent of their capacity for emotion and enjoyment, thus a desire to know more could be a temptation, only then when it appeared as an enlargement of their sensual enjoyment by one hitherto unknown.

Thus the strongest possible, yes, the only possible enticement which could be brought to bear on their souls, developed itself by means of a temptation offered to them, in a magical way, mysteriously exciting the depths of both sides of their being, that of thought and that of sense; and following the enticement without compulsion, they fell, the sin was committed and left behind ineffacable traces in their nature.

This temptation, as it could only come to them from without, was possible only in the form of a lie, for before immediate confidence in the goodness and truthfulness of God, based upon the totality of their condition, had been shaken, there could be for them neither an incitement to greater pleasure nor to greater knowledge. Only when it had been held up to them that the word of prohibition given to them was not good, because the presupposition of the evil of that which was to follow the transgression was not true, thus that God was not good and truthful, then only was it possible that the twofold, and nevertheless one, incitement, through knowledge and trial of the forbidden, to enjoy a hitherto unknown sensual pleasure, and to attain, just through this pleasure, to a knowledge which would, for the future, release them from restraining distinction between good and evil, and thus make them independent of God, led them to sin. Thus a lie which annihilated the truth of their intellectual life resting in God, mistrust which killed their childlike trust, unbelief which deprived them of the inner power to persevere in the life in God, was the root of the first sin.

All this agrees in the most remarkable way with what we found, in a psychologico-empirical way, to be the continuous cause of all human sin, viz., that a false thought, a vain conception, lies at the basis of every sin whether of sense or of pride, begetting both; one is always essentially unbelief in God and mistrust of His Word.

Of course the identity between the origin of sin as contained in the biblical tradition, and that of the particular sins of the following generations is not absolute; for in the former the temptation comes merely from without, in the latter, while it is indeed conditioned by something outward; seen, heard, or simulated, always at the same time attracts itself to something untrue and impure already internally present: however often the one may have the advantage of the other. But this inequality, necessarily involved in the acknowledged condition of innocence of our first parents, is outweighed by the equality of the essential elements of sin in both provinces, and especially by what we have proved in regard to the connection and identity of the impulse to pleasure and to knowledge, while this equality cannot properly be understood if we, with reference to one or the other province, consider sense by itself, or pride by itself as the essence of sin.

2. With all this we by no means deny that even acknowledging this analogy, the origin of the first sin contains something incomprehensible to us, but only in the same way that there is something inconceivable, not to be fully comprehended, in the ethico-religious province in general, which, however, is not absolutely unintelligible, and as there is still continually something incomprehensible in every greater or smaller sin committed in the world, so that every more or less sincere man has to say to himself: It is inconceivable how I could commit this injustice, this fault, this sin. In this respect the never-to-be-forgotten Danub has thought that evil is incomprehensible, is a miracle, but just an evil miracle.* In this situation of things we have the less cause to allow mistrust of the truth and actuality of the biblical account, to be awakened in us, through so to speak the more externally strange and incomprehensible fact, the speaking of the serpent, and its being an organ in the service of the father of lies. Both the equality and inequality with that which we daily experience in us and among us is so striking and so intelligible that we need not go into the particulars.

To us at least it seems impossible to regard that as a myth in

* Ch. *Danub's Judas Iscariot*, Heft. (1818) P. 99.

which *not* an idea, wrapped up in history (which is the nature of a myth) is conveyed, but something which is the opposite of all idea, evil, which is only a fact, and is reported as first having come into the world. However, the author of this has not aimed at a criticism and exegesis of the 3d chap. of Genesis.

We now pass on to some practico-moral deductions from the above propositions.

1. Let him who is in earnest about his moral preservation and development, especially if he has placed himself under the influence of the grace of the gospel, separate from every sensual enjoyment which is right in itself, as it can be taken up into the ethico-religious life of sobriety and love (the Christian complement of what the ancients meant by *σωφροσύνη*), abstract reflection as to whether and the how far this enjoyment is good or not, any attempt to know and comprehend as well the good contained in it, as the evil possibly attaching to it; a tendency in which there is danger of unnaturally potentializing the good contained in it, or of occasioning the possible abuse by forming conceptions of and thinking about it. Let him enjoy in childlike gratitude simply and cheerfully, and just for that reason moderately, mixing along with it nothing foreign, lofty, spiritually idealizing. Such a wish to apprehend the enjoyment of nature, of eating and drinking, of bodily comfort, is always a more or less morbid and vain wish to know the empirical in its connection with the spiritual, and is not only pedantic but proud, and a more refined self-enjoyment by subtilizing by departing from thankfully receiving at the hands of God. To this is allied that whole province of a vain, empty super-acute nicety separating from all sound life, which works so freezingly on the feeling, so weakening upon will and deed, and is related to what a great poet has called "des Gedankens Blässe." To this also belongs the curiosity which attaches itself to the social intercourse and conversation in every day life, for why need we seek to know what may lie possibly behind any natural view? Here too are the roots of all superstitions and false theosophic investigations. Every man who wants

everywhere to investigate, and comprehend where he ought only to see, hear, feel and use his sound senses, who gazes at a thing falsely—philosophizing about it isolates it, is on the way to lose his understanding, which is the beginning of conceitedness in knowledge (*wissens dünkel*).

2. In the effort to attain knowledge, whether in judging the things of common life, or in the scientific treatment of empirical provinces, or of universal ideas, let a man guard himself from suffering his thinking to fall into by-paths where an egotistical self-enjoyment or sensual pleasure becomes mixed with it. Therefore a clear, purely objective view of all natural relations is so important, so that no side thought no matter how enticing may mislead the view. To this must be referred every selfishly entertained presupposition in the investigation of scientific questions which immediately may become a prejudice, every decision of a result before hand, yes, every looking to the result which an investigation, a learned treatise, may have in the circle of those who pass judgment on it. Also an intentional, especially a self-pleasing looking back to an accomplished work can easily draw our spirits into a vain, and so, sensual pleasure, over against the beautiful, truly religious, but not easily practicable principle of the noble French Jansenist. If we have done anything we must forget it in God. Yet more dangerous is that enhancement of the powers of soul and spirit, which is needed for a literary work, through the use of spirituous drinks whereby the work is even begun in an unsound way. We have not meant to say that a psychico-sensual self-feeling naturally accompanying spiritual exertion is sin. In proper subordination it is good, a gift of the divine kindness.

3. Poetry and Art in themselves aim at neither knowledge nor sensual enjoyment, but excite thoughts and judgments, emotions and sensuous perceptions: all art rests on the appearance of the spiritual in a sensuous form. Whoever, without a pure sense for the beautiful, occupies himself with Poetry and Art, whether by way of production or contemplation, is exposed to a double temptation, viz., on the one hand of apprehending the idea of a work of art, with abstract thoughts, on the other

hand of enjoying the *form* with a sensual-unrefined feeling. On this rests the decay and abuse of art, which in turn helps on the errors of empty hypercriticism, and falsely-refined desire of enjoyment. For example the Romance is a poetical work, or should be; but if it is so written that the human spirit appears as called to a proud self-sufficiency and independence of God, or as entitled to a favorite sensual enjoyment, it works destructively on the true life of the soul.

4. As the sphere of pedagogics in a wider sense belongs to ethics we offer some remarks on the combating of the love of pleasure and self-exaltation in the youth, by means of education. Every pleasure, every enjoyment of the senses which is to be granted to youth, ought to be kept right far from vain reflection, and sophistical subtilizing; let it remain open, fresh, joyous, childlike. In this respect gymnastic practice in common is of great worth, when adventuresomeness and ostentation are excluded.

Then, too, much depends, in the development of the spiritual powers of the young, in the training of the understanding, on their not being spurned on by the enticements of sensual rewards and promised enjoyments, by giving vain praise of talents and their consequences; rather by acknowledgments of their moral fidelity, and exertions it, of course, being presupposed that the spirit be not over-done, that an unhappy precocity do not introduce the mind of the boy or youth into spheres which may deceive him in regard to his real talents. Never let mere knowledge appear to the young as the highest destiny, or as self-enjoyment of the soul, but continually, on the one hand with reference to the highest object of knowledge, God to be loved, on the other hand in agreement with manfully active life. Let the art of learning and scientific effort themselves always appear as such (a practical life). Hence it is important also that in introducing the young into the world of ancient classical literature, neither the autonomy nor the beauty of form of the ancients be placed before their eyes as the highest; for the former would tempt them to self-conceit, the latter to sensuality. Assuredly this twofold error can only be avoided when the re-

ligious warrant the absolute moral worth of genuine faith, and of free obedience, the thorough knowledge of God and Jesus Christ, is advanced by a religious instruction, *which* does not seem to be one branch of instruction alongside of others, but by becoming the religious life-element of the school, pervades all other instruction and alone gives to taste for science, literature and native country its proper consecration.

ART. VI.—GERMAN RATIONALISM AND ITS LESSONS FOR THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

BY REV. J. G. ZAHNER, D.D., NEW PHILADELPHIA, OHIO.

WE use this term in its historical sense, not as simply denoting skepticism or infidelity as it may be found, at the present time, in the German Fatherland, but as *the technical name of the mighty effort of the human mind to throw off all authority of the Christian Church, and to subvert Christianity itself as far as it lays claim to be a divine revelation;* forming an important period in the history of German Protestantism, dating from the middle of the seventeenth century and running down to our own time. German Rationalism, in this sense, is not a mere episode, but an eventful phase in the history of German Protestantism, without which it is impossible to account for the present condition and form of the German Protestant Church and German Protestant Theology.

German Rationalism, differing in many respects from English Deism and very materially from French infidelity, has been defined by its more worthy representatives as the mode of thinking which finds it necessary to subject Revealed Religion to the test of our innate reason and other reliable means of human knowledge; but, in fact, it is the mode of thinking which makes common sense the criterion of divine truth, tearing down all the main pillars of Christian truth and reconstructing the various branches of theology, according to the adopted test, no matter

what the results of this mode of procedure would be. But to be able rightly to judge of the nature, rise and progress of German Rationalism, and especially of its scientific and practical results, it will be necessary to cast a glance on the previous history of German Protestantism.

The precious fruit of the Reformation of the sixteenth century was the freedom and independence of the Christian Church, in various European countries, from the tutelage and tyranny of the papal hierarchy, the emancipation of the consciences of God's people from the thraldom of the legal or Judaistic Church system of the middle ages, and, as a further consequence of all this, the establishment of the Protestant Church on the basis of what has since been called the material and formal principle of Protestantism, viz., the justification of the sinner before God by faith only through the merits and righteousness of Christ, and the exclusive normative authority of the canonical books of the Old and New Testament Scriptures in all matters of faith and life, over against the papal dogma of the merititiousness of good works and the co-ordinate normative authority of Church tradition. Thus we see that Protestantism, in its formative period, was not a mere negation of error, but a powerful affirmation and a deeper apprehension of divine truth, and for this reason, also a positive advance on the previous Church life. Yet the new turn, which, in that time, the Christian mind had taken, was not without its peculiar dangers, and most of the Reformers entertained, in the latter part of their lives, the most serious misgivings as to the ultimate consequences of their work. History shows that these misgivings were not without some foundation. The Protestant movement had not progressed very far, when among its chief leaders serious doctrinal differences (the sacramental controversy) arose, which ultimately resulted in two separate organizations, viz., the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. Other phenomena, growing out of the Protestant movement, were still more ominous. Carlstadt and his friends pressed the formal principle of Protestantism in such a manner as to destroy all significance and power in the holy

sacraments as well as all proper Church authority, and it required the strong faith and the mighty eloquence of Luther to repel this heresy. The Anabaptists of Germany and the German Swiss Cantons perverted the doctrine of evangelical liberty into unbridled licentiousness, which resulted in social and political disorders and temporary anarchy. The libertines openly made war against Calvin and his institutions in Geneva, boldly proclaiming the emancipation of the flesh. Others, less fanatical and less immoral, nevertheless threw aside the articles of our common undoubted Christian faith as embodied in the three ancient creeds, substituting in their place their own philosophical notions. Such were, for instance, the early Anti-trinitarians and Socinians, mostly wandering fugitives from papal countries. But these fanatics and ultras of the reformation constituted thus far not the ruling but only the disturbing force of the Protestant movement. Their horrible extravagances and pernicious errors were instinctively repelled by the Christian consciousness of the age. They soon disappeared or sank into insignificance, having made no lasting impression on the Protestant communities.

Roman Catholicism, invigorated by the opposition of Protestantism, assumed its definite form in the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent (1545–63): Lutheranism in the Form of Concord (1577), and the Reformed Churches principally in the Heidelberg Catechism (1563), the second Helvetic confession (1566), the thirty-nine Articles (1571), and the canons of the Synod of Dort (1618–1619). The deadly strife between the old and new systems of faith nevertheless continued, and in France, Holland, and partly also in England and Scotland, Protestantism had to pass through the fiery ordeal of bloody persecutions and religious wars. In Germany the conflict was chiefly carried on with word and pen; yet the thirty years' war had to teach the conflicting parties that the only possible relation they could sustain to each other was peaceful toleration with equal rights for them both.

The *internal history* of German Protestantism from Luther's

death to the close of the thirty years' war shows a decline of the original spirit and life of the Reformation. The unhappy sacramental controversy between Luther and Zwingli and their respective friends already indicated a tendency to intellectualism and doctrinalism, and this tendency grew stronger and stronger, until angry controversialism and stiff dogmatism was the order of the day. Christianity was treated as a mere system of divine doctrine, and the Reformation was looked upon as a revival of *pure* doctrine. To comprehend and express this doctrine in clear and correct dogmatic formulas and to defend and preserve the same against all adversaries and errorists, became the chief labor of the Theologians. Thus the old scholastic method was introduced into Protestant Theology, and the original freshness and biblical simplicity, the vigor, life and unction that characterized the dogmatical productions of the Reformation period (as for instance Calvin's *institutio religionis Christianæ* and Melanchthon's *Loci communes*) had given way to the subtleties and minutiae of the ponderous volumes of Calovius, Koenig, Quenstedt and others. The same one-sided dogmatism and controversialism had, with few exceptions, also taken possession of the pulpit. The results of all this were most deplorable. With the masses of the people, Christianity had almost become a mere matter of opinion and a routine of religious observances; yet the stagnation of the life and spirit of true Christianity was by no means general or complete. The afflictions of the thirty years' war and the labors of men like John Arndt, H. Müller, J. V. Andreae and P. Gerhart, kept the ardor of practical Christianity alive in a great many congregations and individual members of the German Church.

From the middle of the seventeenth century, a new period began. Religion was no longer the all-engrossing subject among the European nations. The political and mercantile interests made themselves more and more felt. The wars continued, but their motives were other than religious. The mighty controversy between Roman Catholicism and Evangelical Protestantism and also between the Lutherans and the Re-

formed had now expended its vital force and almost entirely ceased. Calixtus, at the head of the Lutheran University at Helmstädt, proclaimed a Christianity independent of the Form of Concord, existing in the Bible, in the ancient creeds and in the practical life of Christians. He endeavored to establish peaceful relations between the Lutherans and Reformed and called on the Roman Catholic Church in Germany to break loose from the Pope. Spener, possessing a pious heart and a liberal education, labored for another reformation of the Protestant Church in Germany, a reformation of life, not of doctrine, by means of a more simple and edifying explanation of the Holy Scriptures, the restoration of the general priesthood of believers, and the education of a pious ministry. Thus he became the Father of German Pietism. But Spener and his immediate friends, true sons of the Lutheran Church, had no desire to undermine the Church of their fathers or to deny any of her doctrines, but only to revive and promote practical piety among her ministers and lay members. For this important and desirable end they labored with great earnestness and great success. The new movement, having found its centre at Halle, made itself felt throughout all Protestant countries in Europe, yet with greater strength in Lutheran than in Reformed communities, for the simple reason that these latter had preserved more of the original spirit of the Reformation and had always been more practical and less theoretical in their Church life.

But modest and sober Spener soon found occasion to complain, that "His friends caused him more trouble than his enemies." Starting out with what appeared to them rightful opposition to the reigning dogmatism and controversialism of the times, a great many suffered themselves to run into the other extreme of a purely subjective piety. They became indifferent with regard to the Church, her sacraments, her confessions of faith, her ministry and, in fact, made their own subjective experience the criterion of divine truth. So much of the doctrines of the Bible and the symbolical books, as they could use for "moral application," was retained; all the rest was given to

the winds.* Fanatical extravagancies followed, and this rampant individualism and excited subjectivism paved the way to another and more dangerous enemy of the Protestant Church of Germany, viz., *Rationalism*.

The tendency of the age became more and more to emancipate the human mind from all authority and restraint, and, in fact, to elevate, on the one hand, individual religious experience and on the other individual human reason above the written word of God, and the unanimous voice of the Christian Church in her past history. Here unchurchly degenerated Pietism, running out into various mystical sects, and anti-christian Rationalism met on common ground.

It is indeed, very significant and instructive to see how the University of Halle, the centre of Pietism, where men like Franke, Breithaupt and Anton taught, became in a short time, as it were, the mother of German Rationalism, and that even the Frankean charitable institutions, those monuments of a living faith, passed over into hands of Neology. We need only call the attention of the reader to the labors and writings of Thomasius, Wolf, Semler and Niemeyer to show the correctness of this statement.† It was during the latter part of the seventeenth century that in Germany Pietism and incipient Neology had made a common stand against the reigning Orthodoxy of the times, but when early in the eighteenth century it became evident, that the anti-Church tendency was, in fact, an anti-Christian tendency, when English Deism and French skepticism made their inroads into German literature, when mystics, like Dippel and Edelmann, turned Rationalists, and many orthodox theologians and active pastors began to waver, and did accommodate themselves in language and expression to the new mode of thinking, then the true friends of Christ everywhere, whether of the old or new school, rallied again to the defence of their common cause; and many of those who had foolishly

* Theological students of Halle used to write in the albums of friends, sentences like these:—*Vel Turca sis vel Hebreus Appella: qui bene vivit, erit Christicola mihi.*

† The opponents of Halle brought into vogue the proverb: *Halam tendis, aut pietista aut atheista reversurus.*

suffered themselves to join in the anti-church warfare were thus brought to see the error of their way.*

But Rationalism now became the ruling power in Protestant Germany. Unlike English Deism, which had its origin outside the Church and openly proclaimed its hatred to Christianity, German Rationalism, arose in the bosom of the Church, and boldly claimed to be the legitimate child of the Reformation. Not to come into open conflict with the formal principle of Protestantism, viz., the normative authority of the Holy Scriptures, its teachers and defenders received the Bible as the vehicle of the new religion of reason, and endeavored to show that the Scriptures rightly interpreted taught nothing more than natural theology teaches. The work of disintegration and destruction in every department of theology and the Church, was carried on, without any hesitation, until the grand old structure was pulled down to the ground. Not only the peculiar scholastic form, in which the doctrines of Christianity had been handed down by previous ages, but these doctrines themselves, root and branch, were rejected. It was not long till the old Liturgies and Hymn-books were also put aside or had to undergo a process of modernization.

German Rationalism has its own history. Indifference and aversion toward the Church and her confessions led to indifference and aversion toward the Apostles and their writings and finally even to the denial of the divinity of Christ. Prof. Semler of Halle, raised and educated under the influence of Pietism, represents the transition from unchurchly Pietism to anti-christian Rationalism. Notwithstanding his "private piety," as he called it, he hated the Church and her dogma, and his bold critical and historical researches gradually led him to a denial of the divine inspiration, the authenticity and integrity of

* It must be stated, in this connection, that Pietism in Wurtemberg under the leadership of Dr. Bengel, Oettinger, Steinhofer, Roos and others, was of a churchly nature, and this is one great reason why Rationalism could not get a firm foothold in that country. We meet with the same results in those Reformed Churches in Germany, which did not give up their precious inheritance to any of the unchurchly *isms* of their time.

the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, the biblical prophecies and miracles. The flat common sense philosophy of Wolf, Lessing's controversy with Pastor Goetze; the favor shown by Frederick the Great, to the leaders of French infidelity and English Deism; the writings of Basedow, Nicolai, Bahardt and others, made common Rationalism predominant in Germany. All of Christianity and Theology was given up, except the moral precepts of the Gospel, the idea of God and His providence and the freedom and immortality of man. Human reason was thus enthroned supremely over divine revelation, and common sense adopted as the only measure or rule of truth, human or divine.

Through Kant's criticism, German Rationalism received a more precise and scientific form. In his "Kritik of pure reason," he endeavored to show, that human reason as such could have no certain knowledge of any thing beyond the visible world; that, strictly speaking, the existence of God and the immortality of the human soul were only postulates of practical reason; that is to say, that the moral nature of man demanded them. In like manner, Kant would neither assert nor deny the possibility of a divine revelation. In any way, morality was to him the all in all in Religion. But this Kantian Rationalism, although a great deal more earnest, and not as shallow and arrogant as vulgar Rationalism, was nevertheless unable to stem the strong current of the negative tendency of the age, because it lacked the living root of all true morality, faith in Christ Jesus, the true God-man, the ideal and personification of all holiness. The systems of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel, followed each other in quick succession, and seemed, for a while, more favorable to orthodox Christian Theology than to modern Rationalism; but through Strauss and his abettors, it became soon evident, that, in the bold speculation of Hegel, German Rationalism had reached its most consistent, and therefore its most destructive form. The half-way work and inconsistencies of common Rationalism were unsparingly exposed, and, for earnest science, forever put aside. It came to this; either Christ or Belial; no halting between the two. The his-

toric character of the Gospels was entirely denied and the biblical narratives declared to be myths. The relation of Christ to the Church was reversed. According to this speculative Rationalism, Christ had not founded the Church, but the early Church had unconsciously produced Christ, taking up in their vivid imagination the Messianic hopes and expectations, then in vogue among the Jewish people. The whole heavenly world was declared to be the product of religious imagination, without any objective reality; and God Himself, the infinite Creator, was identified with the finite spirit of man. The cultus of human genius and the emancipation of the flesh were boldly proclaimed. This Pantheism, consistently carried out, will end in the destruction of Christianity and the Church, the overthrow of all civil institutions and the dissolution of human society. In the French revolution at the close of the last century, we have had a practical exemplification of its destructive spirit. It is Anti-Christ in full.

It is not our task now to show, how by the grace of God, German Protestant Theology, Phoenix-like, arose from the ashes of the general conflagration that had swept over its whole field, and how, in consequence thereof, the Church also arose from her ruins. Suffice it to say that both came out of the furnace not exactly in their old shape and form (much of the wood, hay and stubble had been burned), but in a renewed state, centering in Christ, the God-man, and not in any mere single dogma or scientific principle as such. That Christianity is essentially a divine life, sprung from Christ, the Prince of Life, and not mere doctrines; that the Church is His body, mater fidelium and cōtus sanctorum, "Samlerin, Spenderin der, Gnadenmittel" and "gesammelte Gemeinde" constitute the central ideas of this regenerated Theology.

Old Protestant dogmatism could not withstand the tremendous shock of Rationalism, much less modern Supranaturalism, because the *principium rationis* was more or less involved in these systems.

In conclusion, we shall yet call the attention of the reader to

a few practical inferences or lessons to be drawn from our subject for the benefit of our American Churches.

1. Like causes produce like results. The dry, lifeless traditional Theology, which to a greater or less extent is found among the ministers of the different denominations of the country, cannot really satisfy the religious wants of our age. It will not successfully withstand the anti-christian forces at work in our nation; nor be able scientifically to overcome the growing skepticism and materialism of the age. It will not even succeed in successfully foiling the aggressions of Rome.

2. The religious individualism of our sect system, although full of life and action, will not save the Church and the nation. It carries the principle of its dissolution in its own bosom. It is essentially atomistic and separatistic. Its endless distractions, its selfishness and narrow-mindedness make it unfit for the successful evangelization and Christianization of the world, and unfit also for the thorough Christian education of the American youth. Its ultimate consequences will be Rationalism and infidelity.

3. The main tendency of the times is toward Rationalism and infidelity. Our free school education is essentially rationalistic. A great many ministers and lay-members of our Churches, accommodating themselves to the *isms* of the times, unconsciously move in this direction. For popularity's sake, they sail with the current, instead of stemming it.

4. Neither Rationalism, nor unchurchly piety can save us from a relapse into the snares of Popery; for history proves that weary Rationalists and weary enthusiasts have sought firmness and rest in the stability of the Roman Catholic system.

5. Evangelical Protestantism, in avoiding the Scylla of mere petrified Churchism, has also to avoid the Charybdis of unchurchly subjectivism, for both of these extremes prove the grave of sound and vital Christianity.

6. We have no reason to be afraid of the future. Christ, the living Head of the Church, will never abandon His people. He has in all ages, led His bride, the Church, safely through all

the stormy waters of error and persecution ; she has ever come out of them stronger and brighter than before. He will also bring light into the chaos of *our* time. But surely ours is no time to sleep or thoughtlessly swim with the current, but to watch and to pray, and faithfully and understandingly labor for the welfare of Zion ; for great changes, and, consequently, great trials and temptations are at hand. In such times we can have, outside the Holy Scriptures, no better guide than the past history of the Church.

ART. VII.—INFIDELITY.

BY REV. D. GANS, D.D.

THE "signs of the times" would certainly constitute a prolific subject of discourse for the present. At no former period were they perhaps more numerous, and surely never more significant. By their variety, they seem to comprehend every interest appertaining to the present, and in the way of prophecy they point far out into the future, indicating with great distinctness what shall be many years hence.

Into the present, the past seems to have crowded all its vital elements—good, bad and indifferent—moral, religious, civil and political—and these are now in a condition to enter into new combinations, and to be so modified as to direct their course and define their moral influence for the future.

History, like electricity from the clouds, generally moves in a straight line, until by its rapid motion it so condenses the atmosphere before it, as to be turned off in another direction, making thus a zig-zag descent to the earth. The present is that condensed point, and constitutes, therefore, clearly an epoch in the general current of our human life—a stepping stone to something higher, clearer and more closely allied to the ultimate destination of the race.

A great providential movement, we apprehend, is a short distance in advance of us—a movement which will vitally affect all the great social, political and religious interests of the world; and well will it be for the generations to come, if the present is faithful in properly moulding the elements at this turning point or transition period.

The moral aspect of the present period, may seem to indicate a retrograde motion on the part of history, but no single point in any age ought to constitute the ground of a judgment in relation to an interest so continuous, broad and varied as that of history. For the moment, things may seem to stand still—aye, even to move backwards, like the sun on the dial of Ahaz—but if you will wait until the great movement is over for which preparations were being made in the quiet of apparent inaction, you will be able to trace out a continuous and glorious advance. The waters of the Red Sea always give way, and God's people and God's interests generally, though they may halt for the moment, have occasion continually to raise the triumphal song of Moses and Miriam, and praise the Lord for His great deliverances. The darkest part of the night is always that which immediately precedes the dawn; and if it be true that the present is worse than former periods, we regard this truth as one of the significant signs pointing to our speedy deliverance.

But it is not my design (in this article) to dwell upon the "signs of the times" in general. This were too varied a theme for the limits to which we are confined. It is rather to select one of the darkest and most significant of these signs, and by a careful investigation, show its baseless character, and thus endeavor to secure the earnest mind against its aggressive and destructive influence. This, as indicated by the caption of this article, is *infidelity*.

It is perhaps unnecessary to say here, that this evil spirit under its various forms, is present in its great and withering power, in almost every department of life. There is domestic infidelity, and political infidelity; but these different forms of it are the results of religious infidelity, which, under its practical character, is seen everywhere to manifest greater boldness in the present, than it has for many years in the past.

Infidelity, it is true, can boast of greater antiquity, but gray hairs and many years are not always honorable. Sin and vice, of every kind, every shade, and every degree, which right-minded men have always abhorred and despised, come to us in hoary locks. They have left their mark on every age, even up to the youth of the world. Their age, instead of making them venerable, only exhibits them as the more exceeding sinful, and the more to be despised by man and cursed by the Almighty. Christianity, involving a positive faith, has always been accompanied by its negative in the various forms of unbelief.

Infidelity, thus born and baptized in sin, raised and nurtured in iniquity, descending with its original elements through all the various stages of history, itself the leading element in all bold transgressions which mark the past and the present, has never been permitted, at any period, to make the faith of God without effect. Though the Saviour of the world was constrained to marvel at its bold character, yet the great system of Redemption, like a deep and broad stream in the inner life of the world, continued calmly to flow on, imparting its divine benefits to every age; and thus, notwithstanding the threatening aspect of the present, the mighty stream will continue through all the future, without losing any of its efficient power; and when having put in motion all the great machinery of earth—having imparted light, heat, moisture, fertility and beauty to the globe—having inspired literature and science, and spread civilization and true religious, moral and civil freedom through all ranks and conditions of men—making thus the wilderness and solitary places to bloom and blossom as the rose, it will return again, with unexhausted strength and untarnished beauty into the broad bosom of Divinity, whence it rose.

Such is the nature of the great interest of God in the world, that no form of opposition, whether it be negative or positive, scientific or conceived in the credulity of ignorance, whether it pass out from a malicious design, or from an honest but deluded conscience, shall ever be able to destroy any essential element of its divine efficiency. What if some did not believe in the past? What if many do not believe in the present? And what

if still more should permit themselves to fall into the arms of infidelity in the future? Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid.

By infidelity, we mean a general opposition to Christianity. It does not involve a denial of the being and existence of God. This is atheism. An atheist is an infidel, but an infidel, strictly speaking, cannot be an atheist. What infidelity admits atheism denies—namely, the existence of God. “It denies in common with atheism, the divine origin of Christianity” and repudiates the claims which it involves. It protests, not only against the Scriptures as containing a divine revelation, but also against the Church as embodying a divine life. These are the two great sides of Christianity, both claiming to be divine—the one existing in the form of substantial life or grace, and the other in the form of theory, the theory of that life or grace—the one completing the other. The divinity of both these is alike denied and discarded by the infidel, first, theoretically, and second, practically. Sometimes you see practical infidelity without any clearly formed objections of a theoretical character against Christianity, in which cases it implies great ignorance, spiritual stupidity and a degree of degraded moral feeling which can only be reached by long previous and thoughtless habit.

Our design with infidelity as thus defined, is not to trace it out in the different departments in which it exists, not to exhibit it as one of the present age, nor yet to describe directly its evil influences: all this is well known and deeply mourned over by all truly great and good men; but to show if possible, the difficulties of infidelity as a system—its defective character to satisfy the wants of our nature, or to meet the necessities of the age in any view, and thus help, as much as in us lies, to root up its foundation. We would meet the infidel on his own ground, and with him, first of all, calmly and dispassionately consider the *sources* of infidelity. What are the principal sources from which infidels of every school have professed, and do still profess to draw the great foundation principles of their system of unbelief? All concede that these sources are limited to

three; first, Reason, second, Nature, third, Conscience. These, they say, separately or jointly, are sufficient to enable man to meet the design of God and to satisfy the spiritual necessities of his nature; and hence the Bible on the one hand, and the Church on the other, are denied and repudiated.

First, let us look at *Reason* in its relation to spiritual things.

No one, we may here say with truth, is in a condition to make more real account of reason, than the true Christian. No one can regard it in a higher light, invest it with more noble attributes, or make a greater boast of it, than he. The Christian is free to accede candidly to all that the infidel may claim for it, but only when the reason is in its original state, true sphere, and under its proper and legitimate influences. Infidelity says, that reason, as we now find it, is sufficient, independent of revelation, to guide man properly in his relation to God, to himself, and to his fellow-men. Christianity says, that reason is a godlike endowment, and in its original state, pure and luminous as when it came from the Divine hand, it was equal to this duty; for then the heart being pure, God dwelt among men and spake to them face to face, and reason was the medium through which the spiritual light was revealed, the mirror by which the heavenly was reflected.

But now the simple question is, Is reason, at the present, in its original state? Do the same spiritual features attach to it now under the same influences as then?

Infidelity acknowledges the fall of man, and the entrance of the principle of evil. It owns the presence of a depraved nature, wrong tendencies, a perverted state of the will and of the affections, because all these things enter into our experience, and experience the infidel claims as one of his greatest arguments against Christianity. He must therefore acknowledge it here, as well as claim it elsewhere. In acknowledging the principle of experience, he must own the presence of sin, because the first involves the last. But now this moral change of our nature being acknowledged by the infidel on the ground of experience, we ask, what right has he, or any one, to assume that the reason is a safe and sufficient guide at the present, and under its present

abnormal and unnatural circumstances? Because the reason was competent to a certain given duty when in a particular state and under peculiar circumstances, does certainly not prove that it would be equal to the same duty, this state and these circumstances being radically changed.

Here is a difficulty lying at the very threshold of the whole system, based upon the sufficiency of reason, which the infidel has never yet satisfactorily met and disposed of. The only way in which he can get rid of the difficulty is by proving, on strictly philosophical principles, that there is such a divorce between the reason, strictly so called, and the affections or the moral feelings, as to exclude all vital contact; then the result may follow, that the affections may be completely perverted and depraved, whilst the reason, as such, may continue in its original state of clearness, innocence and purity.

But here we make our appeal to reason itself, and ask can this be? Can such a divorce exist in an organic being? Reason cannot answer yes, to a thing which is unreasonable in its very nature. We cannot so split man's being, into two halves, as to justify us in regarding one half as fallen and corrupt, and the other as still existing in its original integrity and purity. Such a thought is simply absurd. No part of a plant can be so separated from every other part that the plant itself will not be vitally affected by it; and yet the constitution of the plant is no more really organic than that of our own being. Man is a unit throughout, indissoluble but by death, and on this account, no single part can be affected without involving more or less his whole being, body, soul and spirit. Such a dualism between the reason and the moral feelings is inconsistent with science and philosophy, and reason itself and all analogy declare it to be false and groundless. To believe even in the possibility of it in the case of a real living man, would require a greater amount of faith, or rather credulity, than Christianity has ever demanded.

Now if Infidelity cannot prove the truth of this dualism between the reason and the affections, then the old difficulty recurs with all its force. How can the affections be depraved

without communicating that depravity to the reason? Is therefore the reason in its original, pure state? It cannot be, feeling as we must, on the principle of experience, the derangement of the affections. And if the reason *has* changed and become corrupt with the feelings, what right has any one to set it up as an infallible guide in spiritual and eternal things? On what principle should the reason, in this view, be looked upon as a safer guide in its department, than the depraved feelings are in theirs?

Besides this—if the infidel were able fully and conclusively to prove this divorce of the reason from the affections, what would he gain in favor of his system? What would be the use of the infallible reason as a guide, when it does not stand in such relation to the affections or to the other part of our being in general, as to influence and lead them in the path which it might indicate? This would be like the relation of a sound and healthy will to a paralyzed arm. What would the healthy condition of the will help in such a case? Could it give vigor and motion to the arm? What, therefore, would be the gain even to admit that the reason is an infallible guide, if it is so divorced from the affections that it cannot govern these? It must be clear, that, if the reason has preserved its purity, it has done so under such a form as to render it practically useless, so far as the original design of it is concerned. Let the infidel then take whichever horn of the dilemma he may choose, and the difficulty will remain and be the same in substance and as unyielding in character.

Reason, then, we conclude from the difficulty suggested by its own nature and condition, is not a competent guide in relation to things spiritual and divine. Limited by its original constitution, and carnalized by its lapse into sin, it can never so penetrate the deep things of God and the complicated relations we sustain to Him by creation and especially by the great system of grace, as to lead us safely through the present darkness, to the true light—the highest end of our being.

From every true investigation of the nature and original elements of the reason, the conclusion follows with irresistible

necessity, that *faith* was its leading feature; and this is the reason why, in its primary condition, it was competent to meet and fulfil the spiritual purposes of God in reference to man. Its innate and original limitation was thus counteracted, and it was qualified by its nature, united with faith, to take in the conception of the infinite, and to understand the spiritual. Reason and faith do not exclude each other, as light and darkness, but penetrate each other as in the case of two substances in a true chemical compound, and mutually act upon each other, as soul and body—the one completing the other. Faith is the soul of reason and its highest glory; and as when the soul is separated, the body dies, so when faith, by reason of sin, was divorced from the understanding, it died to all the higher and spiritual realities with which it was originally conversant. To reason without faith is to be infidel, just as really so, as to believe without reason is to be credulous and fanatic. The two were bound together by original creation, and have therefore a natural affinity for each other; and what God has thus united may not, without the most serious detriment to our well doing, be torn asunder.

What were thus separated by sin, it is the design now of Christianity again to re-unite. Hence Christianity is so frequently called the *new creation*. The reason, by the fall, has not lost its capacity for faith—its throne and image are still in the reason, though the beautiful queen has fled.

Reason and natural faith (which is the abiding type of the spiritual) are even now always united in every healthful action of the mind, in reference to the objects of the present world. You see, for instance, a seed placed into the ground; presently it puts forth its roots, then its stem, then its branches, leaves, blossoms, and finally its fruit: but can you see the power that works in it, the law that pervades it producing all these changes, and which in the midst of them all, preserves its species as an individual plant, differing from all other plants? And what does the naturalist do when by reason he is thus led to the boundary of reason, with the plain evidence before him, that beyond this there lies an all persuasive power? Does he deny

this power or law, simply because he cannot seize it, demonstrate it, or analyze it by his reason? No; but he *believes* it! Does not the veriest infidel do so? If he do not, then he plainly denies the foundation of all science, even the most logically exact and scrupulously precise; for what tyro does not know that every science rests upon some given truth, as a basis, some axiom, which can neither be analyzed nor demonstrated, but which simply appeals to reason as such, and which the mind receives and endorses by the principle of natural faith. He, therefore, who denies that faith belongs legitimately to reason, denies at the same time the validity of every scientific conclusion, because the foundation of all science is simple belief or faith. From this basis arises the whole scientific superstructure, which has been the boast of infidels themselves of every age! How strange that the very weapons made use of by unbelief trace themselves back to faith, from which they receive all the authority and force which they possess!

Now infidelity, which denies the whole analogy of faith, as it lies in the ordinary, natural process of acquiring knowledge, simply proves itself to be unnatural, to be set against the very law and course of nature; and to be irrational also, for the very nature of reason implies and requires the pure lamp of faith to be suspended in the very centre of its being, illuminating its darkness, and enabling it to receive the spiritual, and understand that which lies beyond its natural but morally darkened powers. At this point we ask then, if reason is in its purely isolated state unsatisfactory in reference to the *carnal* things of the present life, how can it be competent in relation to spiritual things—the deep things of God and of the life to come? The conclusion is, that that only is true reason, which, feeling the great spiritual want, leads to the supply, the only competent guide, which is found in the kingdom of God—Jesus Christ the day-star, *τα πνύτα εν πνεύμῳ*, and His word, the lamp to our feet and a light to our path.

Second. The second source of infidelity is Nature—God's world, or the handiworks of the Almighty.

In regard to these things we may say, as we have already

said in reference to reason, that no one can admire them more highly, and make more account of them, as displaying the nature and laws of God, than the Christian. In what infidel book descriptive of nature can you find lines of praise, beautiful, graphic, all-comprehensive, like these: "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handiworks; day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night proclaimeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world."

Then in the new revelation you find the following: "For the invisible things of Him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen by the things that are made, even His eternal power and godhead; so that they (even the heathen) are without excuse."

Has Paine, or Bolingbroke, or Hume, or Gibbon, or any other infidel writer, ancient or modern, ever composed a higher and more splendid eulogy on nature than this? Have all their high-wrought and elaborate descriptions of God's Handiworks—hailing nature as the great Bible or book of God—expatiating with learned pride upon its vastness, its unchangeable order, its perfect harmony, diversified drapery and gorgeous beauties—do all these combined enunciate to the praise of Nature and the glory of the Creator, the one thousandth part of what is comprehended in these few, simple, but unique lines? Infidelity would always do well to borrow from divine revelation, at least in this respect.

But the question now to be considered is, whether nature is a sufficient guide for man in his spiritual being and relations? In concluding upon this question, there are two things which must ever be before our minds. The first is, that reason, like the affections, as we have already seen, is in a perverted, depraved and darkened condition. This is the conclusion of every legitimate process of investigation, and is confirmed by experience, which the infidel cannot deny and yet claim respect consistently for what he regards as his strongest argument—the argument based upon experience. It is now with this depraved

and perverted reason that we approach the Handiworks of the Almighty, with a view to penetrate them, understand them, and extract the will of God from them. In view of this fact, the question is—not what the light of nature would be to a pure and sinless mind, or what the light of nature is in itself, but what it is to a mind which has lost its original virtue and become darkened and naturally inclined to that which is false and wrong.

The second fact which must carefully be borne in mind in deciding upon the capacity of nature to lead man with a perverted reason to proper conclusions in reference to the will of God and his own true destiny, is, the state of Nature itself. Is nature now in precisely the same condition as when it came from the hand of God? Has the sin which made such a deep and radical impression upon the world of mind, deranging every faculty, produced no change in the physical world? What mean those tares, and briars, and thorns, which grow spontaneously in every locality? What mean the earthquakes, pestilences and famine to which every quarter of the globe is witness? Natural science bears the most unequivocal testimony to the far-reaching and comprehensive truth of Revelation, when it thus declares: "The whole creation, groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now." It is clear therefore, without going any further into the subject at this point, that nature itself is diseased, and does not sustain the same relation to the spiritual which it at first sustained, when it came pure and luminous from the hand of God; nor can it therefore be capable of guiding the spirit of man now, as it was then. Nature, as in the case of the second temple erected at Jerusalem after the captivity, has lost its true glory in this view. No voice now sounds from behind the veil, as in ancient times, to acquaint men in a certain and authoritative way with the will of heaven. The shekinah has disappeared because of sin, and the oracle is separated from its guiding wisdom and its true divine glory. Silence and darkness now reign together through all the handiworks of God.

Here then are plainly two facts growing out of experience and

confirmed by the discovery of science itself, which show that both reason and nature are in a very different condition now from what they were in the beginning. In view of this great and radical change, have we any right, on the ground of science, or from any other view of the case, to affirm that that which was sufficient to guide man in the beginning or prior to the change, is sufficient now or after the change? Plainly, this would be to make no account of the change at all.

But let us bring the case to a more practical issue. If it is still contended that nature is competent to this great task, then it must follow that nature must utter the same voice in all localities, speak the same language to every people, and everywhere teach the same fundamental lessons to all who apply to it for instruction. God's will is one and the same everywhere, and nature must teach the same general principles to all minds in an infallible manner. This is what we claim for Revelation in its proper condition, and is a fair test of the claims of anything that professes to take the place of Revelation and accomplish the ends which it proposes.

Let now any one become conversant with the different systems, as they are called, of infidelity, which are professedly based upon nature, examine them for himself, and see whether, to the infidel mind, nature has invariably spoken the same things. These systems contain anything but *harmony*. If time permitted, we should take pleasure in showing the discrepancies and radical contradictions, from the books, which abound in every direction and upon every subject. Look back upon the ancient world and down through the deep darkness of Heathenism, and do the things which you there discover, prove that nature is sufficient to guide man, independent of revelation? On the supposition that it is—how do you account for heathenism at all? Nature, objectively, is to the heathen world the same as it is to the Christian; it is just as majestic and glorious; it is just as wonderfully diversified; and why, if nature is sufficient, are the people lapsed into such gross mental and moral darkness?

We cannot here argue that there is any deficiency in the way

of original mental endowment between the heathen and the Christian mind. Look at the great Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, Zeno, Socrates and Cicero. Were they not individuals known to the world? Were they not the founders of the most distinguished schools of philosophy and general learning? And do they not even now hold a sway over the mind which even the wisdom of the nineteenth century cannot break, because it cannot rise superior to them; and yet these great mental prodigies were heathen, struggling with a corrupt nature which they could not understand, and depressed by a moral gloom which they could not penetrate. Will the infidel tell us how to account for all these things?

In regard to the question, What is the chief good? (the most fundamental of all questions) Cicero says, "there was so great a dissension among the philosophers, that it was almost impossible to enumerate their different sentiments. More than one hundred different opinions on this subject are gathered from their works."

Then look at their idolatry. They deified planets, reptiles, wood and stone.

From this, turn and look at their practices, which were defended and justified by their best men. Self-murder, hatred, revenge, adultery, lying, theft, rapine and plunder—all these were defended in the broad light of Nature! Infidelity, what say you of the picture? It will not do to deny history, and here the account is given in the plainest possible terms. How emphatically true the stanza familiar to us all:—

"Blind unbelief is sure to err,
And scan God's works in vain:
God is His own interpreter,
And He must make it plain."

Take up any of the more modern systems of unbelief, which profess to receive their material from nature, those for instance, of Herbert and Hume, of Bolingbroke and Hobbes, of Spinoza and Paine—compare them together, and upon what great principle, save that of opposition to Christianity, do they agree?

The one affirms, and the other denies. What have you left in the way of positive truth, or even positive error? If you take their combined teaching, it is clear to perceive that nothing is left on which you might stand. The ultimate result of all false reasoning, is *negation*, and in no department is this result so clearly reached, as in that of infidelity. If you take the trouble to examine a goodly number of them together, you well find this fact fully verified, that there is not a single crime forbidden in the entire moral law, which does not find an advocate, though he may be contradicted by others, in some one of these various champions for the sufficiency of reason and nature. Now we ask in the name both of nature and reason, How can all this contradiction, contrariety and immorality, mirrored muddily in their own systems, be reconciled with the claim, that reason and nature are competent to the work of leading men in the right way, socially, morally and religiously?

Here it would be in place to advert to the moral character of those who advocate these and similar systems. Biography and history, in regard to this point, are full and decided; but propriety compels us to pass this point over in silence. Nature, therefore, has failed as a source of any system which denies revelation.

The *third* source claimed by the unbeliever the world over, is *conscience*. The infidel says that even if it could be shown that reason and nature were not sufficient, man could still fall back upon conscience, which being given by the Almighty for the express purpose of bearing witness to the truth, would itself be sufficient as a guide to him in relation to all things that pertain to time and eternity. Having this, he proudly asks—Why the Bible? It is important therefore that we learn the true nature and office of the conscience. It has been the habit of the infidel mind always, when it is driven from its other two strongholds upon which we have now briefly dwelt, to take refuge in the conscience; and this principally because the believer is accustomed to look upon it as being vested with the very highest authority for the soul. This resort always indicates a kind of begging the question, a disposition to make common

cause of the differences, to build its vague and inconsistent structure upon a foundation admitted by all. But we cannot allow the adversary, even in his most fatal necessity, to erect so human a system upon so divine a foundation; and the reason we will assign.

The conscience wrongly understood, may indeed at least seem to furnish a basis for the efforts of the infidel mind. But it is not difficult to detect the fallacy and expose the sophistry.

If conscience be regarded as an *intellectual* faculty in our being, actively originating thought, or as an intellectual judge, taking up the case in an original way and investigating and analyzing it independently of any other faculty or faculties, and then deciding upon the right and the wrong in the case, it might indeed be appealed to by the infidel in support of his theory. For if conscience, notwithstanding the fall and the consequent depravity of nature, has this intellectual character, is still always on the side of right and against wrong, in such a way as to know infallibly what is right, and what is wrong, it follows that it would be a safe guide, even though reason and nature should both fail.

But just here plainly lies the fallacy. Conscience is not reason—is not the mind, and does not belong to the galaxy of the intellect strictly speaking, at all. It belongs wholly to the moral department of our being strictly so defined, as distinguished from the intellectual. It has therefore nothing to do in determining the questions—intellectually: What is right? What is wrong? This is the work of the reason, or the intellect. This belongs to the analyzing power of the mind strictly so called. For this the intellect was given; this is its duty and mission in our being.

When the mind, properly so called, takes hold of any subject or matter involving morals, it investigates it, as the attorney does the facts in a case at law, and after the investigation is completed, it then makes a representation of them to the judge or conscience. The conscience then acts upon the *representation* which the mind has made. It knows nothing beyond this. This representation may be true, or it may be false, that

is, it may be a legitimate result of the facts which the mind had under investigation, or it may be a misrepresentation of those facts. The decision of conscience, therefore, upon the representation, is always in a hypothetical form. It says, if this be a correct representation, and if it be intellectually true, then it is right; if, however, it be incorrect and untrue, then it is wrong. Thus conscience is always on the side of right, so far as right is made known to it by the mind; for it is clearly dependent upon the mind, at every step, seeing that it can make no intellectual investigations of itself.

From this it is not difficult to see that the responsibility of the judgments of the conscience falls back directly upon the reason: and we have seen that the reason is darkened by sin and naturally prone to error. It may mistake in facts, and in the relation and connection of principles; and even knowing the whole truth, its moral perverseness may lead it to keep back a part for the very purpose of deceiving the conscience. Thus the mind may represent as truth to the conscience that which, in fact, is actually false. What will the conscience do in this case? What can it do but decide upon the representation, that it is true and good? In the same way, the mind may represent a thing to be false and wrong, whereas in fact, it may be true and right. The judgment of the conscience will be in accordance with the intellectual representation. Here are wrong and false judgments made by the conscience, because error was either designedly represented as truth, on the ground of which (and the conscience had no other ground) it decided. The fault is not in the conscience, but in the understanding and heart, which the conscience shows by reversing the judgment as soon as the error is detected. And whilst in the midst of this deception of the mind and heart, we are bound to obey our conscience, right or wrong, because we have within us no higher authority, we are equally bound (and this obligation precedes the other) so to guard the operations of our mind as to secure a correct and right conscience.

This shows the solemnity of the work of making up what are called our *opinions*. Nothing can well be of a more serious

nature, because they affect and mould the conscience. How carefully, in forming our opinions, should we guard against mere prejudice—mere desire that the truth should be thus or so—against all mere habit, which tends to lead us in one direction rather than in another—and to be open for truth itself.

The fact that conscience is no intellectual faculty and cannot therefore analyze and distinguish intellectually between the true and the false, the good and the evil, fully accounts for the different and contradictory decisions of conscience in different localities and under different circumstances. If it were an intellectual investigator and a moral judge at the same time, then it would follow, if its nature is to be always on the side of the right, that, in regard to the same thing, its judgments would always and everywhere be the same. But this is by no means the case, and simply because moral subjects are *intellectually* regarded and represented in very different lights. Men may be equally conscientious who stand on the opposite sides of moral questions. We see this every day of our lives. Why is this? Not certainly because the conscience of the one means to be with the truth, and that of the other means to be against it. They are both equally earnest and sincere, and conscience, in both cases alike, means to be on the side of truth. The reason, is that the truth is differently understood by the parties, and that the conscience is dependent upon this difference of understanding.

The Hindoos require self-immolation under the wheels of an idol's car. The South-Sea Islanders regard it as right to bury their aged parents alive, and put to death their infant children in the most inhuman and cruel manner. The ancient Spartans committed theft as a virtue, and highly extolled, and, sometimes even rewarded the shrewdness of him who could accomplish his thieving purposes without detection. Even the Apostle Paul, previous to his conversion, thought honestly that he was doing God service, when he was tearing down the Churches and destroying the followers of Christ.

Thus we might proceed through all the grades of Heathenism, and also through those of the nominally civilized and

Christianized countries, but where the standard of divine revelation is not set up and received *in fact*—showing that conscience is not the intellectual judge, but simply the approver or disapprover of things which the mind, after a serious investigation, represents to be either right or wrong, good or evil. Conscience is not the judge, deciding intellectually upon the right or wrong. This is the office of the reason. But conscience is the jury, which makes application of the law and the facts as it receives them from the reason and the understanding. Conscience cannot go beyond the representation of the mind, and upon the mind it is dependent for the true or false character of the judgments to which it may come.

This now being the true view of conscience, how does it affect the claims of infidelity? Simply thus:—it destroys its last refuge. For if conscience is thus dependent upon the reason, then it certainly cannot be a better guide *than* the reason. But reason itself is corrupted and depraved, as we have already seen; it leads to darkness and error rather than to light and truth. Where then is the solid foundation for infidelity? Reason has failed; Nature has failed; and Conscience has failed. Take these in their combined character, let them collect and concentrate all their strength and wisdom, and would it be possible for them to discover the grand system of grace by which God has proposed, in mercy, to bring our ruined race back to Himself, in which His justice is magnified, while the ungodly are justified? Nature, for the merely natural eye, has no trace of this, nor has the reason or the conscience. To what else will it appeal? Upon what else will it attempt to rear its system, to prove that God is no longer needed in the world? Behold the baseless fabric of a vision! It is grand only in its pretensions, hollow as the sepulchres of the dead, and no less offensive to true reason and sound moral judgment. Let it crumble to the earth, that, in its ruins, it may illustrate the pride and folly of mortals, who, receiving a faint spark of reason from the great fountain of all light and knowledge, goodness and truth, would then run away and declare itself to be the independent fountain of light!

The general conclusion, then, of this whole discussion, is, that two things, in our present darkened and depraved state, are absolutely necessary; first, a supernatural *light*, to enlighten the reason, and this we find in the Scriptures of divine inspiration, which are infallible in all their teaching; and second, a supernatural *grace*, to change the heart, and create the principle of divine love or moral sympathy with the character of God, which is the substantial basis of all true knowledge of spiritual things, and this we find in the Church, which is the Body of Christ.

We had intended, at this point, with a view to illustrate still more fully the baseless character of infidelity, to advert to the origin of Christianity—its nature and the circumstances which attended its birth into the world—the fact that it occurred just at a time when the mind was most painfully awake and best qualified to judge of its true character—the fact that it was received and endorsed by the world—that it calmed the great heart of the world as nothing else could calm it, and that it constituted the great turning point in history, modifying and conditioning every form of life and activity since that time; but we find that, for want of time, this simple annunciation of the argument, is all that can be given at the present.

A few remarks upon the comparative superiority of those countries which enjoy the institutions of the gospel, over those which have been overrun by the principles of unbelief, and we shall close.

As types of all the rest, we here point to France and England. We must here stop to premise that we do not now refer to Catholic France; for whatever other charges might, by the Protestant mind, be brought against France in this view, it would not be possible to bring that of unbelief or infidelity. Nor do we refer to Protestant France, properly so called, for here too is faith, and faith, at different points in her history, of a very earnest and vigorous character. We refer to infidel France—to France as she fell at different times under the practical power of an infidel principle—as she enthroned Reason as her goddess, at whose shrine she then bowed, and discarded the

sacred authority of Christianity—deriding its claims and mocking its great Founder, Jesus Christ.

Look at France under this view in her eventful history. Like the restless tide, she has experienced a perpetual ebb and flow. For the moment, peace would steal over her surface, like the calm and gentle breeze of evening over the great deep, and almost before she has had time to enjoy its holy pleasure, her nerves would begin to twitch in every part of her body politic, which would continue and increase until her whole system would lie prostrate in the severe spasm of revolution. To see her deep throes and throbs only sketched by the hand of history, is enough to induce a shudder in the breast of every true philanthropist and patriot. Contemplate her licentiousness and cruelty; her divorces of the sacred marriage tie and degradation of woman; her murders and cruel wrongs; her reign of despotism with her reign of Reason, and what human heart will not turn away from the picture with the sincere prayer: Oh God, pity and have mercy upon the weakness and folly of humanity!

And why all this? Simply, if not solely, because Christianity was ignored, and infidelity, boastfully grounded upon Reason, was inaugurated in its stead. History here speaks like the mother to the child, in the most simple and unadorned language. He that runs may read, and he that reads may fully understand.

Now, compare this dark picture with that presented in England, or any other country, at the same period, where the Christian church was honored and where the Bible was allowed to speak its own beautiful, simple, heavenly language. How different the general aspect! How calm and peaceful the great heart of the nation! How prosperous in all the intellectual, social, and civil enterprises, that spread happiness, stability, and plenty through all the departments of life, uniting the nation in one great soul, and causing each to say feelingly—I am proud to be an Englishman! Passing from the one country into the other, in any of these characteristic periods or epochs, is like passing from the storm and the earthquake into the calm

and gentle breeze which is felt at the opening of day, or when the sun retires—soothing, stilling, yet inspiring—lifting the soul to God and the undimmed beauties of Heaven.

Now, why the difference? Let the unbeliever, taking the lamp of experience for his guide, explain why it is.

The same great difference, described and illustrated by history, runs through all the veins of a nation's life. Admit Christianity into the heart of a nation in the form of a divine institution, bearing with it the elements of spiritual life and grace for the heart, and that nation has an anchor which will hold it firm and steady amid all the storms of revolution, and cause it to result only in reformation, cleansing its impurity and restoring its excellencies. Let the Holy Bible—the divinely compressed book of gems—which is literally a compound of magnificence above all order—let this divine volume, in the bosom of the Christian church, be uplifted as the standard of doctrine and the source of morals, and that nation is safe, prosperous, united, and happy, beyond the power of any human agency to make it otherwise. The Bible, we are aware, requires our obedience, and not our eulogy. We cannot paint the rose, nor add beauty to the lily. The Bible stands unique, rich in its own charms, defying the world in all its boasted wisdom, either to add to or take from it. It passes through every age as the sun passes through the circle of every day, the true glory of the world.

The celebrated Scaliger was so enraptured with its high intellectual and chaste classical merit, as to be led to say on one occasion, that he would rather have been the author of the single stanza, in the 18th Psalm, rendered by Sternhold and Hopkins:

On Cherub, and on Cherubim,
Full royally he rode;
And on the wings of mighty winds,
Came flying all abroad,

than to have possessed and enjoyed the Kingdom of Arragon.

In view, now, of the radical insufficiency, of the sources of infidelity, and in view, still further, of the historical testimony

in favor of Christianity and against unbelief, at which, for the present, we can cast but a glance, all which is ample and clear, we must be permitted here to say, that it requires something of boldness, not to intimate a more debasing disposition, and a degree of ignorance and carnal stupidity not often found in this land, for any individual calmly and deliberately to rise up and say, that Christianity is an imposition, and the Bible a cunningly devised fable. It would be to say *raca* to all the world before him, and very modestly to claim for himself all the wisdom. In one thing such an one surely is not wise, and that is, in the knowledge of himself. However reluctantly it may be, yet, as regards the matter of his own wisdom, he will be constrained to concede, that the world around him, if not the venerated and hoary past, knows more than he; and if it, with this advantage, should, accidentally, call him a *madman*, the odds certainly would be very considerable; nor should he take it as unkind, or as involving, in any way, a breach of true gentility.

We close by adverting to the *practical* confirmation of all that has now been said. What is it that meets the deeply-felt spiritual necessities of every soul, like Christianity? Just as, at its humble birth in Bethlehem, it satisfied the restless longings of all the past, being its complete fulfillment, and sent lively currents of joy even to the utmost borders of our common humanity, so does it now fully satisfy the deepest wants of every individual who applies to it. Christianity embraced, expels fear, allays every apprehension of the future, calms the soul in the midst of the greatest throes of nature, and causes the sunbeams of joy and happiness to spread all through the moral being. This has been, and this is, the experience of thousands. How will infidelity, running in the face of its own darling principle—experience—explain away what thousands have and do still experience? As well, surely, might he seek to deny his image reflected from the placid water.

The Christian is composed and resigned even when he feels that, because of disease, his sands of life are almost exhausted. He calmly approaches his end, and the nearer he approximates

it, like the fond father returning to his loved home, the more ardently does he rejoice, while the prayer goes up, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."

Does infidelity thus prepare any soul to exchange worlds? Would you hear the last words of a few? Then listen that you may hear, and hearing, understand the hollowness of infidelity.

Francis Newport, when death was in view, looking towards the fire burning in his chamber, said: "Oh that I was to lie and broil upon that fire for a hundred thousand years, to purchase the favor of God, to be reconciled to Him again. But it is fruitless—vain wish; millions of millions of years will bring me no nearer to the end of my tortures, than one poor hour. Oh, Eternity! Eternity! who can properly paraphrase upon the words—forever and ever!"

Voltaire, the hero of modern infidelity, in his last illness, seeing the doctor approaching him, exclaimed in deep agony: "I am abandoned of God and man. Doctor, I will give you half of what I am worth, if you will give me six months' life." The doctor answered: "Sir, you cannot live six weeks." *Voltaire* replied: "Then I shall go to hell, and you will go with me;" and soon after he expired.

Hobbes, being informed that his end was near at hand, said: "I shall be glad, then, to find a hole to creep out of the world at."

Altamont, the noble, when dying, seeing the minister approach him, said: "You have come too late; I have neither life nor hope." "Heaven," said the minister, "is merciful." "Or," replied the dying man, "I could not have been thus guilty. What has it not done to bless and save me? I have been too strong for Omnipotence; I plucked down ruin." "Redeemer" fell from the minister's lips. He started—his eyes rolled wildly. "Hold! hold!" he cried in deep agony; "you wound me—this is the rock on which I split. I denied His name."

Now, contrast this seriously with the dying language of the Christian, and then tell me is infidelity worthy to take the place

of Christianity. Hear it, as it comes back from the departing spirit, clothed in the garments of salvation and pinioned for Heaven ; “ O, death, where is thy sting ? O, grave, where is thy victory ? The sting of death is sin ; and the strength of sin is the law ; but thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Every fact, therefore, within the sphere of our observation in the physical world, in the moral relations of men, and in the history of nations and of the human race, is a proof of man’s dependence upon God, and of the fact that his true well-being can be promoted only to the extent that he voluntarily, through faith and a pious mind, casts himself upon the Divine Being. Man is a creature of law, hemmed in with relations on all hands, which are but the expressions of the Divine will, and which constantly refer to and condition him, physically, intellectually, and morally ; and out of which, and beyond which he can no more exist and prosper and attain true happiness under any view, than he can breathe without the atmosphere, swim without water, or walk without a solid, sustaining substance. And as the proof is overwhelming of man’s natural insufficiency, and of the *natural* provisions made by the Divine will to control and aid him, so, and no less strong and abundant are the evidences that in Christianity God has made *supernatural* provisions for man’s elevation, enlightenment, and transformation, so that he can—not without, but with Divine aid—not in reliance, in the spirit of infidelity, upon the natural, but in reliance in the spirit of faith and purity upon the supernatural and Divine provisions, attain his true and highest end.

ART. VIII.—THE CHURCH IN HISTORY.

BY REV. G. DERING WOLFF, A. M.

GOING back to the days of our Saviour's personal presence on the earth, a short time before His ascension, we behold Him standing on a mountain in Galilee, with His eleven disciples. We hear Him give to them their commission : "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I command you: and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen!" This was their commission. It involved nothing less than the complete transformation of the world,—the removal of all existing prejudices, the overthrow of every existing form of religion, of every school of philosophy, and of every political institution, founded on the false principles which then interpenetrated the whole social structure, and, still more, the total destruction of sin under every form, and the substitution of holiness in its place.

Consider the time and circumstances under which this mighty work was to be commenced. It was not at a time when the influential nations of the earth, and those upon whom they had stamped the type of their own ideas, considered themselves rude and ignorant,—when they had not as yet made any investigations into the fundamental principles of individual action and of their social institutions, and when therefore, under a consciousness of their own intellectual and moral deficiencies, they were ready to receive instruction and rebuke. Nothing of the kind. "It was an age of boasted civilization, of culture, of politeness, of grandeur. Poets, orators, painters, and sculptors then lived, who have never since been equalled." There was

all the pride of power, of governments, the weight of whose authority extended over vast portions of the earth's surface, whose polity was looked upon as wise and equitable, whose laws were respected, whose machinery worked efficiently into the most remote provinces, and the right of whose citizenship was prized as a most precious possession. There was all the softness of luxury, all the refinements of cultivated taste, all the intellectual acuteness and activity which philosophic schools could give, conducted and sustained by men whose extraordinary powers of thought cause them to be regarded, to this day, as masters of dialectic skill. Men were then as proud of the civilization of their age, as men now are of the civilization of this age. They boasted, then, of their learning, their artistic triumphs, their philosophic attainments, as they now do.

As for their religions, all the power of philosophy, and all the adornments which art and music, and poetry could give, were exhausted in rendering them attractive. Their temples were models of beauty, and their ceremonies were as imposing and impressive as cultivated taste and judgment could render them. In the solemn processions and worship, were to be found the statesman and the soldier, the old man venerable with his silvered hair, the matron admirable in her chaste beauty and womanly grace, and white-robed and white-armed virgins, like opening rose-buds, just blushing into womanhood. Poesy embodied their religious legends, in language which to this day is looked to as examples of graceful composition. Their religious feelings were strengthened by patriotic associations. With them were connected their national history, their progress in arts, their social improvement, their reverses in war, their conquests and triumphs.

These remarks hold good, to a greater or less degree, in regard to all the nations of those times, but particularly so in regard to those two, which had stamped upon all the rest the type of their own characters and civilization—the Greek and the Roman. The first, fickle by nature, changing from day to day, imaginative, versatile and fanciful, stood at the head of the human race in philosophy, poetry, eloquence, and art. The

latter, constant and unchanging, by instinct a venerator of the past, abhorrent of all novelty, the representative of law, of order, of stability,—to whom the state was all, the individual nothing,—a people above all others of enduring patience, of constant faith, of untiring energy, of unmovable fixedness of purpose—ever living in their recollections of the past, proud of what they had done and strong in the conviction of what they still could do, ever striving to actualize and excel the past in the present and the future,—despising all things pertaining to other nations, proudly and haughtily adherent to their own.

This was the world which our Saviour sent forth those eleven men to conquer—to more than conquer, to transform. Out of the infinite divisions of races, of peoples, of tongues, and the infinite varieties of climates, of customs and of ideas, in the midst of the darkness of pride, of false philosophy, of wrong intellectual culture, of luxury and all its attendant vices, they were to create a new people—unlike all others, different from all, opposed to all in every essential respect, and especially in those respects, in regard to which it is most difficult to change mankind;—a people, which though divided in a thousand ways, should yet be *one*, bound together by the attraction of *one* common centre, having *one* faith, acknowledging *one* LORD, receiving *one* BAPTISM, working *through* and ruled by *one* organization, and government, THE CHURCH.

Consider now the *locality* whence the efforts to accomplish all this were to emanate. Not from a country superior to all those which we have mentioned, in the prestige of military skill, of science, or of excellent civil polity—not from a people looked up to with admiration, on account of their intelligence, culture, or prosperity; nor yet from a country in close communication with other portions of the earth, whence intercourse would be easy, and movements emanating thence would rapidly extend themselves; but from a “land (to use the words of an eloquent divine) bounded on the west by the waters of the Mediterranean Sea, across which it sent not a single ship, on the east by mountains and deserts over which no caravan from this land

passed. On the north and south were hostile neighbors ever to be avoided."

"The people of this land claimed an old history, dating back some two thousand years, the rehearsal of which was an insult and a menace to all other nations. The people of this land spoke a rude and unpolished language of the olden times; their religion was repulsive for its austerity, and its ceremonies were despised. It was the land of Judea—a fossil land—a mock and a gibe among the nations—and in Judea men spoke with contempt of its rudest port, Galilee."

By the sandy beach of the sea of Galilee under the towering mountains which overshadowed it, stood the Saviour with this little band of poor, unlettered, obscure fishermen and publicans, the despised even of a despised nation, followers of a man rejected by His own countrymen, and put to death upon a Roman gibbet as a malefactor and impostor. Giving to them their commission, He sent them forth to a work far more difficult than to remove the mountains, under which they stood—mountains of prejudice, of passion, of disbelief, of wickedness towering higher than those mountains of Galilee, mountains rooted in the pride of human intellect and power, in the force of human habit, and of human vices, more deeply, than were those Galilean mountains in the foundations of the earth. What was the result? Let history reply.

Those men went forth with *faith*. Commencing at Jerusalem they passed into all the provinces of Asia Minor; into Greece, the home of arts, of science, of philosophy; to Egypt, the repository of occult mysteries, of the hidden secrets of knowledge; to Rome, the capital of Italy, of the civilized world, the source of law and authority, the seat of government and the centre of power. Their voices were heard in the islands of the Mediterranean, in Macedonia, Pamphylia, Phrygia, Arabia, and Scythia, as well as in the marts of Tyre and Smyrna, and the philosophic schools of Athens, Antioch, Ephesus, and Alexandria. They penetrated, in the one direction, to the banks of the Indus and the Ganges, in the other to the shores of the Atlantic ocean.

Thus they went forth into all lands, speaking in foreign tongues and strange accents, ever preaching Christ crucified, to the Greeks foolishness, to the Jews a stumbling-block, to the Romans,—both foolishness in the light of their philosophy, a stumbling-block as contradicting all their national associations and self-love; meeting face to face the polish, and eloquence, and intellectual vigor of Greece, and Egypt, and Italy; meeting sages, philosophers, orators, poets; they went forth preaching the deep mysteries of the revelation, comprehended in Christ; calling on men to give up all their philosophic speculations, all their beautiful mythology, to cast away all their poetical ideas and images, so dear to the oriental mind, and to receive, instead, the seemingly unreasonable and unphilosophical mysteries of this new teaching; and in place of their national gods, to worship as the one, only, true God—a person who, as a man, even in their own day, had walked on the earth, had been suspected, reviled, hated, and crucified by the officers of a Roman province. They called on them to give up their passions, the habits of years, that were sanctioned by public opinion; to practice charity and humility, instead of selfishness and pride; chastity and purity instead of licentiousness; and, in a word, to conquer themselves; to achieve the most difficult of all victories—victory over self.

This was their work. If they succeeded, would it not be accomplishing what, to all human judgment, was an impossibility? Think of the obstacles in the way of success. They found strong opposition on the part of men bound to their passions, on the part of the heathen priesthood, on the part of men who loved their country, and who upheld with obstinacy their religious customs and mythologies, intertwined as they were with their country's history, and its ancient glories.

Nor had Satan, the enemy of Christ, lost his skill or cunning. Nor did he relax his fell purpose to withstand the truth. Seizing on all the influences of national pride, of intellectual eminence, of philosophical prejudices, of selfish interests, he

combined them in the hands of the Roman emperor. Then the days of persecution fell upon the Church.

The Apostles were treated as conspirators against the peace of society and the established institutions of the State. They were imprisoned, were scourged, stoned, and crucified. Of the twelve but one escaped a violent death, and he only by a miracle. These first martyrs passed away, but their work ceased not. They had trained up St. Titus, St. Timothy, St. Mark, St. Luke, St. Clement, St. Linus, and many others, and to them and their fellow-laborers they entrusted the work. These labored in faith, meeting a like treatment with their predecessors at the hands of persecutors. The arches of the Coliseum often rang with the shouts of exulting thousands as wild beasts tore them to pieces and drank their life-blood. They were followed by others still faithfully striving to do the work assigned to them by their Divine Master, patiently enduring, like those who had gone before, hatred, contumely, suffering, and death. Of the *first thirty-one bishops of Rome, twenty-seven* sealed their faith with their blood. Thus the work of Christ went on, and the work of persecution kept even pace. If at times the sword of the Roman emperor was still, it was only that the wearied arm might regain its strength. The day had come when "the brother betrayed the brother to death, and the father the son; and children rose up against their parents, and caused them to be put to death."

But the faith of these Christians did not fail. They sought refuge in the dens and caves of the earth, when their persecutors pursued them too closely. In the Catacombs of Rome they erected their altars, and went out thence to make converts. In the dark recesses of those Catacombs we have evidences to this day of their endurance, their faith, and their worship, in the monuments, the pictures and sculpture, and inscriptions, which still remain. There, in the ordinance of Holy Baptism, they subjected the new-born babe to the washing of regeneration; there they gave the grace of Confirmation to the catechumen; there they received the Holy Communion of the body and

blood of Christ; and there, when life departed, their bodies were "deposited"—reverently *laid away*, to await the resurrection of the dead.

Thus the earnest and unequal struggle went on for three hundred years. On the one side were human learning, human culture, human prejudices, passion, and vices, old established institutions, laws, civil and military and ecclesiastical powers, all combined in deadly opposition, guided by Satanic cunning, aided by Satanic strength. On the other, twelve Apostles of a despised malefactor, and their equally despised followers.

What was the result? Did the mountains refuse to move? Were the obstacles the Christians encountered invincible? In the power of that faith, which was like a grain of mustard seed, they labored, they endured, they fought—and victory crowned their cause. The words of Christ were fulfilled. The "mountains" obeyed them. "Nothing" was "impossible" to them. Even the learning of the times yielded. "The pallium of the philosopher fell in graceful folds from the shoulders of many a Christian convert." The world, in wonder, beheld such men as Cyril, of Alexandria, and Origen, preëminent in philosophy and science, as well as in faith and piety. The faith of Christ triumphed everywhere, so that the Christian apologist might say with truth "There is no nation, or state, or city or people where Christianity has not been preached. We are but as yesterday, yet are we found in the courts, in the palace, in the armies, in the navies, in the fields, everywhere—save in the heathen temples, which are fast becoming deserted. Heathenism passed away. The Roman emperor himself—he who occupied the seat of the Cæsars, and was worshiped as a god—bowed before the crucified Lord, and proclaimed himself a Christian; and that cross which broke resplendent from the clouds upon the eyes of Constantine and his soldiers, enwreathed with letters of light—*In hoc signo vinces*—shone forth in the rays of the sun, as they fell upon the Roman capitol; *In hoc signo vinces*—a motto we might well adopt in this, our day. By this sign, by the cross, thou shalt conquer. It was displayed in the seat and centre of heathen power, on the banner of every Roman

Legion. Christianity had triumphed—triumphed over false philosophy, pride, passion, the force of old habits, the vices of men, the pride of power—over everything that stood in its way.

The mountains were removed. But was the work of Christians fully done? Did Satan abandon the struggle? Did the gates of hell no longer strive to prevail? Ah, no. The struggle continued, though under another form. In receiving into her bosom, those who had lived under the influence of heathen thought, and heathen customs, the Church necessarily admitted persons who were weak in faith, and imperfect in Christian knowledge and nurture. “The effect of this was first seen in laxity of manners, in ambition, in the loss of Christian virtue and fervor. The Church had to struggle against these encroachments of vice. Then was she beheld resisting them on all sides, preaching the stern precepts of divine morality, reproving in season and out of season, doing everything to lead men back to purity and innocence before God.”

And, that the world might behold the *heroism of virtue*, in those days of luxury, of ease, of refinement, there were raised up in the bosom of the Church *whole orders* of holy anchorites,—the monks and ascetics of early times, who devoted themselves to lives of devout contemplation, of prayer, of self-denial, of labor—living protests against self-indulgence—beacon lights from which men might learn to be in the world, and yet not of it.

Many now are inclined to sneer at the rigid austerity and self-denial of those holy men—to look upon them as foolish enthusiasts. They were indeed enthusiasts, and it would be well for those, who thus sneer, to have some of their enthusiasm. They were fools, as Paul was, for Christ’s sake—and their foolishness was the means of converting thousands to the truth.

But there was still another difficulty in the way of Christian progress. Heresies sprang up. Satan strove to lead men into the by-paths of error. Then did the Church call together her Bishops in council, even, as in the days of the Apostles, she did at Jerusalem. Thus, for example, at Nice, where the heresy of

Arius—denying the divinity of the Saviour, was to be encountered, and overcome; so also at Ephesus, at Constantinople, at Chalcedon. She encountered the heresies which threatened to dim her faith—and by her authoritative voice, pronounced, in the fulness of her faith, in the promises of Christ, of His presence, and of the gifts and guidance of the Holy Spirit, she overcame those heresies. There was no indecision, no compromising of the truth. She expelled from her bosom the heretical, schismatical tendencies—as our Saviour drove out the demons, from those who were possessed. She had FAITH—and by the power of that faith, she removed the *mountains* of heresy, which were in her way—and kept the truth delivered to the saints, pure for its transmission to our age.

That we may more fully realize the work done in those first three centuries after the Ascension of our Saviour, let us recall to mind the fact, that in that time was established and defined every fundamental doctrine of our Holy Religion. To that age, to the faith of *that* age, we owe our Holy Apostolic Creed, the Nicene Creed, and a little later, the Athanasian Creed.

And now what facilities had the Church to aid her in her mighty work? Had she Bible and Tract Societies, religious newspapers and periodicals—printing presses and colporteurs? Nothing of the kind. She had associations of pious and holy men. She had no *Bible*, much less the means of disseminating it. In those days the Church had not determined in what the Bible consisted. Her most pious, most learned, and most saintly men, differed among themselves, as to what constituted the sacred Scriptures. They quoted the writings of St. Ireneus, St. Polycarp, St. Clement, and others, as of equal authority with those of St. Luke, and St. John. Not only private laymen, but the higher Clergy, the Bishops, and whole provinces of churches did not possess all the books which now compose the sacred Scriptures. One Church had the Gospel according to St. Matthew, but was destitute of all the other Gospels; another that of St. Mark; another of St. Luke. So with the Epistles.

Any town of five thousand inhabitants in the United States has, to-day, I doubt not, a greater number of full and com-

plete copies of the Sacred Scriptures, than the whole Italian, or Egyptian, or Asiatic Church, had of any of the separate books which now form the Bible. They had no facilities for traveling, or disseminating knowledge. The seas swarmed with pirates—the land with robbers. A journey from Italy to Spain involved more hardships and dangers, than a circuit round the world would now.

The Church did this work then without the Bible,—before the Bible was formed. She had the truths of Christianity living in her own faith, and by the power of that truth, as thus actualized in her faith, she conquered the world, and overcame heresy. And now were the Church's troubles over?—the work of making disciples of all nations done? It was only to begin again.

During the period between the 5th and 10th centuries, we have another phase of the Church's life, and another illustration on a most grand scale, of the power of faith.

The Goths, the Heruli, the Franks, the Huns, the Vandals, and other fierce and barbarous tribes invaded the whole of Christianized Europe, and penetrated even into Africa. They moved forward with resistless power, sweeping away like a deluge almost every vestige of civilization, burning and sacking cities, devastating countries, destroying kingdoms, governments, laws and social order, burying under their own ignorance and barbarism all the monuments of ancient learning, so that intellectual and moral darkness covered the face of Europe.

The barbarians, who did this, were not men whom the Christians of that day could easily influence. They were not men of a soft, and docile disposition, men who could be easily turned from their established habits—easily persuaded to abandon their lives of lawless activity and almost constant warfare, and yield to the influences of superior intelligence. On the contrary, they were men of fierce passions, of strong wills, of never-tiring energy, and of ceaseless activity in their own wild way,—men who prided themselves on being superior in their rude ignorance (of which they boasted) and in their brute strength and fierce courage, to the effeminate, though cultivated peoples whom they overrun.

They honored and cherished the ideas of a wild and cruel heathenism, which they clung to with all the tenacity of their fierce and obstinate natures; and they despised, as the cause of weakness, if not of cowardice, the Christian Religion.

The most prominent attributes of their gods were war and cruelty. Hence they conquered only to destroy. They demolished every thing, and built up nothing. Nor did they remain in one country long enough to settle even into comparative quietude,—but passed on to new conquests,—or rather new devastations. The territory they last left was immediately invaded by another tribe still more rapacious and destructive. Thus they pushed on each other, as wave does wave, covering all Europe, for several centuries, with a deluge of barbarism and ignorance, fierce, indocile, cruel.

Here then was new work for Christians to do. Did they succeed? Before answering this question, let us endeavor to form an idea of the difficulty of the task. We will illustrate it by a comparison with a similar work, now incumbent on the Christian Church.

We have, in our own land, a people somewhat like the Northern hordes, which invaded Europe, in their fondness for a wild and savage life, in their preference for a state of constant warfare to that of peace, and in their unwillingness to adopt the habits of civilized life; a people, however, far inferior to those ancient barbarians, in intellectual vigor, in force of character, in tenacity of purpose, and in attachment to their religious legends. We refer to our Indian tribes.

We have for about three hundred years—a space of time equal in extent to that in which the Church broke down the power of heathenism in primitive ages—endeavored to Christianize these Indians. Have we succeeded? We have sent among them missionaries, and established schools, have given them ploughs, and printing presses, and translated the Bible into their native tongues. All this we have done. But this does not answer the question. Have we made *Christians* of these Indians? Our success, or rather our want of success, has been such, that the question itself sounds like a sar-

casm. For three hundred years we have been endeavoring, after a certain fashion, to fulfill our duty to these Indians, and the result of our efforts has been no perceptible improvement, but rather deterioration, and gradual extinction. Is not our experience, at the present day, very much after the pattern of the New England Puritans of old, who tried first preaching to them through George Elliot, and then concluded that Miles Standish, and the sword and musket, were the most effective way of dealing with them? Let us look upon a picture contained in an extract from Bancroft, the historian: "Because the Narragansett Indians had afforded shelter to such of the Pokanots, as had escaped extermination, the New England Colonists resolved to consider them as enemies. A little before the winter solstice, a thousand men, commanded by the brave Josiah Winslow, invaded their territory. * * * Feeble palisades could not check the valor of the white men, and the group of Indian cabins was soon set on fire. Thus were swept away the humble glories of the Narragansets. Their winter's store of provisions—their baskets filled with corn—their cabins lined with mats, all the little comforts of savage life, and yet more, their old men—their women—their babes were consumed in one common conflagration."

"Then, indeed, was the cup of misery filled for these red men. Without shelter, and without food, they hid themselves in a cedar swamp, with no defense against the cold, but boughs of evergreen trees. They prowled the forest, and pawed up the snow, to gather nuts, and acorns; they dug the earth for ground-nuts; they ate remnants of horse flesh as a luxury; they sank down and died from feebleness, and cold, and want of food."

So, too, the Pequod Indians: "After nearly a whole night," (says Bancroft,) "spent in prayer by the very learned and godly Stone, the New England army surprised the principal Pequod town at break of day. Fighting hand to hand, the massacre spread from wigwam to wigwam; but victory came too tardily. We must burn them, shouted Mason, (the New England commander) and cast a fire-brand to windward among the light mats of the Indian cabins. Hardly could the Colonists withdraw to

encompass the place, before the whole encampment was in a blaze. Did the helpless natives climb the palisades, the flames assisted the marksmen to take good aim at the unprotected men. Did they attempt to sally forth, they were cut down by the English broad-swords. The carnage was complete. Not an Indian was spared. About six hundred men, women, and children perished. Most of them in the hideous conflagration. In about an hour, the whole work of destruction was finished with the loss of but two of the Colonists."

Are not the above truthful pictures of the manner, in which we—a Christian nation—have dealt with, and are dealing with the Indian race? We send them Bibles and missionaries, and implements of civilized life; but we have not succeeded in Christianizing them. And we are driven at last to resort to the torch, the sword, the musket and the *scalping-knife* as the only practicable way of settling the questions, which arise between *their barbarity* and *our Christianity*. Or, along with the habits of civilized life, we teach them its vices, and inoculate them with its worst diseases, and thus we are gradually, but surely, working their destruction.

Is not this, too, a fair example of the action of our modern Christian civilization upon all the tribes and nations of heathendom, with which we are brought into contact? All the unchristianized nations melt away and become extinct. Witness the natives of the Sandwich Islands, of Australia, of Tasmania, of all the Islands of the South Sea.

Now the use I wish to make of these indisputable facts is simply this: If the difficulty in the way of our Christianizing barbarous tribes is so great, as to be equal to the removal of mountains, a virtual impossibility—what must have been the difficulty of the work,—imposed upon the Church of the middle ages in Christianizing the barbarians of those times? It must be remembered that we, in our missionary efforts, can use appliances, which had no existence in the middle ages. We approach barbarous nations too with the prestige of superiority, not only in education and the arts, but also in arms. The rela-

tion of the Christians of the early periods of the middle ages, to those whom they sought to Christianize, was just the reverse of that now described. The Christians were subjugated, and regarded by their barbarous conquerors as their inferiors.

Like the Ark of Noah, or the boat in which the Saviour slept upon the Sea of Galilee, the Church floated securely amid that deluge of nations, and while the waters were yet surging around her, she sent forth her heralds of salvation. All through that period of contradiction and confusion,—where we meet with great faith and great barbarism,—great virtues and great vices,—profound learning and profound ignorance—they labored steadily and in faith, holding up the cross. In that time of disarrangement and confusion, that time of distress, when men in despair felt that society had broken loose from its moorings—and the world was so disturbed, so disordered, so convulsed, that its longer existence was impossible, and that its end was at hand, the Church was the one only certain, steadfast landmark, the only sure source of hope and refuge.

Through all those ages the Church was most active, and most successful in Christianizing the natives. Her missionaries went forth, without families, without friends, without protectors. They had not the seal of the Secretary of State, and the power of the English, or American nation, to protect them from insult, and secure to them respect and safety. They had no trains of servants, and horses, and camels, and elephants, to transport their baggage, and secure their comfort and ease. They went forth with their staff and their scrip, sustained and protected by the power of FAITH; and they succeeded in their mission. To the Church of the middle ages the civilized world owes almost everything. It was her legislation which laid the foundation of law, of social order, of all the glories of that civilization with which the nations of the earth are now blest.

The Christians of those middle ages were *live* men, men who would be counted giants if they lived in this our day. They were men of INVINCIBLE FAITH, and by its power they removed mountains, and wrought still mightier miracles. We refer now

not only to the moral transformations they effected, but also to the actual physical miracles, which they wrought.*

It were desirable to draw, not from the miserable and false caricatures of those ages, which fill the pages of most modern writers, but from the original sources of history a few pictures of the holy men of those days, but space will not permit. They were men, who in their faith were wise as serpents. They understood the age and its wants, and to it they devoted all the energies of their strong natures—strong because energized by virginal purity of life, by prayer, by devout meditation, by perfect self-denial and self-abnegation, by earnest study of the truth comprehended in Christ Jesus, by contemplation and holy emulation of the Saints, who had preceded them, and, above all, by the strength derived from a faith which fulfilled itself in implicit and humble and perfect, unquestioning obedience to *authority*, the authority of the kingdom of Christ, the Church, the pillar and ground of the truth. Hence it was that the Saints of the middle ages have left behind them a record of usefulness, of self-denying devotion to the good of the people, of the human race, such as no subsequent age has furnished.

They were the *benefactors* of the people; their *protectors* against the disorders of the times. They interposed successfully, time and again, to uphold and vindicate the authority and law of Christ, as represented by His Church, against the arbitrary actions, or unrighteous enactments of passionate, licentious, or rapacious nobles, kings, and emperors.

They could, like John the Baptist, reprove a licentious ruler for his wicked lust, and compel him to bow to the voice and

* We know that it is the fashion of this age of skepticism and unbelief to sneer at the very possibility of a miracle in the middle ages, and to reject without discrimination the irrefutable proofs, by which many of those miracles are sustained, along with unauthenticated accounts of others, which have their origin in unintelligent and pious credulity. But many of those miracles are attested as strongly as any fact can be; and the same spirit of unquestioning and uninvestigating skepticism which leads to the rejection of faith in them, must also compel a like disbelief in the reality of the miracles wrought by the primitive Christians, and even of those wrought by the Apostles, and by the Saviour Himself. When, we would inquire of these sneering skeptics, did the age of miracles cease in the Christian Church? And where is the warrant in Scripture for believing that it has ceased, or ever will cease?

authority of the Church. They could resist and repress unchristian legislation. They could compel a rapacious king or noble to disgorge, and restore what he had plundered from the Church, from her charitable institutions, or from private individuals. They could prevent men from indulging, as they now too often do, in legal polygamy ; divorcing the wives to whom they have been bound by ties, which only death can part, and living in concubinage, sanctioned by the civil law, with other women. They had *faith*, and therefore before their just rebukes wicked rulers quailed and repented. Have we this power ? Have we this faith ? When wicked, unchristian, *Anti-Christian* and *infidel* laws are enacted, can the Church successfully interpose ? Look at the subject of marriage, taken out of the hands of the Church ; at the education of the young, stripped, too, of all real, distinctive, Christian character. Look at your graveyards, bought by your fathers, as was the cave of Maepelah by Abraham, with money, that they might be places—*consecrated places forever*—where their bodies might be laid away to repose in peace, until the resurrection of the dead ; and when the Legislature of a State, or the municipal council of a city or borough chooses, the children of those who bought and consecrated that burial place are robbed of their property, the homes of their fathers are sold for money, and the Christian faith that our bodies ARE “*temples of the Holy Ghost*,” that there IS a “resurrection of the dead,” is set at naught. Aye ! and when a portion of the body of Christ, and certainly not the most insignificant, or the least venerable, unsuccessfully protests against all this, men, calling themselves Christian men, occupying influential positions in Christian communities, can rejoice at the unsuccessful result. It was not so in the middle ages.

Because of their faithfulness in the respects mentioned, these mediæval Christians are often held up to reproach, and represented as intermeddling, exacting, arbitrary, haughty, and impracticable. But so to-day would the official ruffian or robber, the arbitrary magistrate, the corrupt office-holder, the denier of the religious sanctity and indissolubility of marriage, the social disorganizer, the infidel agitator, all combine in denouncing

Christians who would faithfully rebuke and steadfastly resist them. When history is impartially written, it will be clear as day that to the Christian institutions of the middle ages, and to the men who stood at their head is due whatever of light and virtue, of civil right, and of social order, then prevailed.

But to return. Amid the most discouraging circumstances the Christians of those ages prosecuted their work. They established schools, libraries, and universities. By the slow process of the pen they multiplied copies of the sacred writings, and of other valuable productions. They taught agriculture and the arts, felled forests and drained marshes, introduced social order and prosperity where before lawlessness reigned, so that it became a German proverb, "That it was better to live under the shadow of a monastery, than within the walls of a city;" a Swiss maxim—"Better to be governed by a Bishop's crozier, than by a monarch's sceptre."

In connection with every monastery and Abbey there was usually a scriptorium, where a company of skilled writers was constantly kept employed in multiplying copies of sacred books. When, as was often the case in the disorders of those times, those institutions were attacked, the library—its most valuable treasure—was the first thing thought of, the first thing to be saved. There are frequent accounts in the writings of those times of monks flying to the hills half clad, with their arms filled with holy books, or bundles of them bound upon their shoulders.

That you may realize how mightily and successfully the Christians of those middle ages (sometimes miscalled dark) wrought to dispel ignorance, and stimulate the mind of those rude barbarians to activity, let me recount a few of the evidences of intellectual development, of social improvement, and of material progress, in which those times abound:

1. We owe to that period our modern languages. The Italian with its softness and sweetness; the Spanish, with its stately dignity; the French, with its grace and delicacy; the English, with its strength and practical directness; the German, with its copiousness and philosophic power. Language is but the

body in which ideas clothe themselves ; and the period which could produce these languages must have been full of living thoughts.

2. To that period we owe the rise of modern poetry, the invention of rhythmic measures, which distinguish modern from ancient poetry. Danté, Petrarch, and Chaucer, the father of English poetry, belong to that period ; fixed stars of the first magnitude in the literary firmament.

3. To that period we owe the expression and actualization of the true relation of woman to society ; and in this one idea we have a certain rule by which to measure man's real progress. In no barbarous nation has woman ever been allowed her proper place. Amid all the false refinement and luxury, and intellectual light of Grecian and Roman civilization, her worth was not appreciated, her true relation to man utterly ignored. Not so in the middle ages. During that period she was first conducted with respect and honor to her proper social position. Time will not permit me to dwell at length upon this point ; suffice it to say, in the face of all the silly talk in this, our day, upon the subject, that it is to the middle ages that we must look for the exhibition of the true idea of woman, and her true relation to society. There we find her occupying a position *along-side* of man—his equal, his help-mate, his companion—not through the unsexing of woman, not by endeavoring to abolish that distinction which God made, when “male and female created He them,” not by forcing woman to throw away her greatest charms, her strongest claim to man's admiration and love, her delicacy, her tenderness, and her modesty, but by recognizing the full value of those qualities, by doing full homage to the graces of her character, and the importance of the functions she was destined to fulfill in the social economy. Thus was woman allowed to remain woman, and at the same time respected, cherished, loved, and honored *as WOMAN*. And those ages abounded in noble women, whose memories deserve to be handed down to all ages for admiration. They were women who rose to distinction, not by unsexing themselves, but retaining all the grace, and delicacy, and refinement of their womanly

characters. Very many ladies in that age were distinguished for their learning; many understood thoroughly the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages. More than one taught philosophy and Belles-Lettres, in the University of Bologna. And nowhere can you find among the strong-minded women of the present day, any who are the superiors in literary attainments, in strength of character, or practical usefulness, to Anna Camena, Modesta di Pozzo, Cassandra Fideles, Isabella di Cordova, Isabella di Roseres, Aloysia Sigea, not to mention Heloise, Queen Margaret, of Sweden, and Joan, of Arc.

4. To the Christianity of the middle ages we owe all our present safeguards for the preservation of civil liberty. To that age we owe the Magna Charta, the trial by jury, the establishment of municipal governments, of representative governments, of confederated governments; all those ideas which we this day regard as essential to the best forms of social order. In the Christian legislation of an early period of the middle ages, were laid the foundations of law, and of all the glories of that civilization of which we boast.

Listen to an exposition of the true object of law, and to whom the law-making power belongs, handed down from those times:

"The law, strictly speaking, is directed primarily and principally to the common good. And to decree anything for the common benefit belongs either to the whole people, or to some one acting in their place." Listen to the utterance of that age as to the best form of government: "Wherefore that choice of rulers is best, when one is chosen for his merit, and under him other rulers are chosen for their merit. The government belongs to all, because the rulers may be chosen from any class of society, and the choice is made by all."

These words were written nearly 700 years ago, in the thirteenth century, by a man mighty in learning, in intellectual gifts, in personal piety, and purity—St. Thomas Aquinas.

5. To that age we owe in music—the invention of the Gammut, and the development of the element of harmony, which has done so much to give variety, expression, and power to music.

6. To that age we owe the discovery of the art of making paper out of cotton and linen.
7. Of illuminated writing, and of staining glass.
8. The general introduction of glass itself.
9. The art of printing by hand. This was first invented in the tenth century, and only more fully made known and brought into use by Faust and Guttenburg in the fifteenth.
10. The revival of Architecture.
11. The Mariner's Compass.
12. Gunpowder, spectacles, clocks.
13. Banks, banking systems, and post offices..
14. The introduction of the silk-worm.
15. Of Arabian figures, and the Arabic method of notation, A. D., 991. Algebra, 1412. Stone coal, 1307.
16. The establishment of Universities. Oxford, 866. Cambridge, 915. Paris, about 800. As for Italy, she swarmed with universities—at Rome, Padua, Pavia, Bologna, Pisa, and other places of less note. So in Spain. And misgoverned, down-trodden Ireland of to-day, had early in the middle ages universities, to which thousands of students, from distant countries in Europe, resorted. For universities then numbered students by thousands. In the thirteenth century the University of Paris had 18,000 students, and Oxford had 30,000.

But it was ITALY which, to use the language of the historian Hallam, "supplied the fire from which other nations in this first revival of letters, as afterwards in the second, lighted their torches—Lanfranc, Anselm, Peter Lombard, the founder of systematic theology in the twelfth century, Irnerius, the restorer of jurisprudence, Gratian, the author of the first compilation of the Common Law. The School of Salerno, which guided medical art in all countries, the first dictionary of the Latin language, the first treatise on Algebra, the first great work on Anatomy, are, says Hallam, as truly and exclusively the boast of Italy, during the middle ages, as are the restoration of the Greek Literature and of classical taste, during the fifteenth century.

Away then with the libel that the Church of the middle ages,

its institutions, or its clergy were an obstacle to civilization,—to intellectual, artistic, moral or political progress. It is a libel both upon Christianity itself, and upon History; and its repetition is always the result either of limited and superficial knowledge, or of a wilful and malicious perversion of the truth.

The Christians of those ages did not, it must be admitted, do, as we in this age do. They did not *first* try to civilize and educate, and *then* to Christianize. They reversed the process. They first Christianized, and then, by the stimulating, vitalizing power of Christian truth itself, they aroused and excited the slumbering energies of the mind. And this is the true process. And to this they owe their eminent success. Success—far beyond what we are achieving in enlightening barbarous nations in this age of telegraphs and railroads, when we worship with heathenish devotion the idea of material progress, and practically ignore the spiritual necessities of man.

It must be borne in mind, that in educating men, we do not raise them above the plane on which they naturally stand; but we leave them still subject to the influences and conditions, which necessarily rule them, in virtue of their relation by nature to sin, and to the kingdom of Satan. Their powers and faculties may be the more fully developed by mere education, but still remain unsanctified, and can thus be employed by the ruler of this world the more efficiently in his warfare against the kingdom of Christ. But when men, however rude and ignorant, are introduced into the kingdom of heaven, they are lifted thereby up to a higher plane, are placed in new relations, and within reach of *super-natural* influences and conditions. Whatever knowledge they then acquire, and whatever intellectual or social progress they make, will be sanctified by the power of Christianity and made subservient to its high and holy purposes. The ignoring of this in some cases, and its open denial in others, is the *PROTON-PSEUDOS* in the popular thinking of the present day, and in its schemes of political and social progress.

Of the extent of the Church's success in enlightening rude masses, the people of England, Belgium, France, Germany, and the United States, are the living witnesses. For it was their

ancestors who were the fierce and barbarous heathens who dwelt in, or overrun the wilds of Britain; the wastes and marshes which bordered the Baltic, the forests and mountains of Germany, the Alpine valleys of Switzerland, and the plains of France, and whom the Church of the middle ages subdued, Christianized and civilized. And while she was in process of successfully carrying this work forward, she was called upon to enter upon another equally great and difficult, growing out of the rise and diffusion of Mohammedanism. Originating in Arabia, it spread with great rapidity, subjugating, in a few years, Western Asia and Northern Africa. On the one hand it passed into Spain; on the other, it crossed the Hellespont, and invaded Europe from the South and East. Its two columns closing steadily towards each other, threatened to crush and swallow up all Christendom. Then the efficacy of faith was again displayed by the Church. When kings, nobles, and people, all alike distrusted their own valor and strength, and quailed in terror before Moslem bow and spear,—when the promptings of patriotism seem to lose their power, and even love for their hearths and homes, to give way to fear;—when men were ready, in their despair, to abandon country and all they commonly hold dear, the voice of the Church spoke forth in trumpet tones, and roused them to action. It was *her FAITH* which rolled back the invading flood and delivered Europe from the rule of the false prophet, and caused the splendor of the crescent to pale before the glory of the cross.

Those ages may well be called “ages of faith.” It was by the power of *faith*,—faith in Christ, growing like the grain of mustard seed into faith in “His body, the Church,”—faith in His kingdom, and authority as comprehended in the Church, faith in the divine word as proclaimed by the Church, faith in divine grace as exhibited and handed over to the Christian in and through the sacraments of the Church—it was by *this* faith that the Church conquered the powers of earth and hell.

What are natural impossibilities, were not impossibilities to the Christians of those ages, for they were not simply men; men they were, but they were saints also, filled with and ener-

gized by FAITH,—whose fervent piety, holy enthusiasm, angelic purity, and self-denying devotion caused them to be set as fixed stars in the Christian firmament, where they will continue to shine with ever-increasing brightness through all ages.

ART. IX.—CHURCH UNION.

BY THE EDITOR.

Adoption of the Report of the Joint Committee of Conference on Re-union by the General Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church, New York, May 27th, 1869. Circular Letter issued by the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America, and addressed to the Assemblies, Synods, and Judicatories of the several branches of the Evangelical Catholic Church in America, calling a National Convention to meet in New York on the third Tuesday of October, 1869.

Resolutions referring to the union of the two leading divisions of the Lutheran Church, offered by Dr. Stork at a meeting of the General Synod in Washington, May, 1869.

A Sermon, delivered at the opening of the New School General Assembly, New York, May 20th, 1869, by Rev. J. F. Stearns, D.D., Moderator of the last Assembly.

THE papers here brought to view are sufficient to indicate something of the movements and dispositions looking towards union among some of the leading Protestant Churches of this country. They open up a chapter of history deserving of a place beside the chapter referring to the Catholic movement going on in the Episcopal Church, which we noticed in the last number of this Review.

We regard the re-union of the Presbyterian Church, as embraced by the General Assemblies of the Old and New School, as virtually accomplished. The following is the action, adopted unanimously by the N. S. Assembly, and with but seven dis-

senting votes in the O. S. Assembly, at their recent sessions in New York :

"Believing that the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom would be promoted by the healing of our divisions, and that the two bodies bearing the same name, having the same constitution, and each recognizing the other as a sound and orthodox body according to the principles of the confession common to both, cannot be justified by any but the most imperative reasons in maintaining separate, and, in some respects, rival organizations; we are now clearly of the opinion that the re-union of these bodies ought, as soon as the necessary steps can be taken, to be accomplished, upon the basis hereinafter set forth:—

"1. The Presbyterian Churches in the United States of America, namely, that whose General Assembly convened in the Brick Church in the city of New York, on the 20th day of May, 1869, and that whose General Assembly met in the Church of the Covenant in the said city on the same day, shall be re-united as one Church, under the name and style of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, possessing all the legal and corporate rights and powers pertaining to the Church previous to the division in 1838, and all the legal and corporate rights and powers which the separate Churches now possess.

"2. The re-union shall be effected on the doctrinal and ecclesiastical basis of our common standards; the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments shall be acknowledged to be the inspired Word of God, and the only infallible rule of faith and practice; the Confession of Faith shall continue to be sincerely received and adopted as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures; and the government and discipline of the Presbyterian Church in the United States shall be approved as containing the principles and rules of our polity."

This basis was ordered to be sent down to the Presbyteries, to meet on or before the 15th day of October, 1869, and the action had thereon is to be reported to a meeting of the two Assemblies, to be convened in Pittsburg, Pa., on the second Wednesday of November, 1869. There can be little doubt that

this action of the General Assemblies will be confirmed by the lower courts, and the union of these branches of the Presbyterian Church consummated within the next six months.

The Lutheran Church is divided very much as the Presbyterian has been, into two leading bodies, represented by the General Council and the General Synod. The difference between them, however, we regard as broader and deeper. The General Synod can hardly be said to represent a united or homogeneous Church. It contains within it, alongside of other material, those elements of American Lutheranism which have fallen under the foreign Spirit of Methodism. There is a constant struggle between the principles of the educational system of religion, and the emotional, as this latter exhibits itself in the revival, anxious-bench meetings. The General Council, according to our view, is the exponent of Lutheranism in its true, historical, character. It represents also, the larger Church numerically. The resolutions looking towards re-union, offered by Dr. Stork, one of the editors of the Lutheran Observer, are stated in a secular paper to have been adopted, but in the Observer to have been laid on the table, by the General Synod, on the ground that the General Council would not likely entertain them favorably. They present no principle of union, and seem to have been prompted by *feeling* merely, which is very good in its place, but which affords little to rest any movement of this kind upon.

The Circular from the Reformed (Dutch) Church, looks to a less intimate, but more comprehensive union. It does not contemplate an attempt immediately to reach an organic union of all Protestant Churches, but rather to discuss the project of forming some outward alliance, which may perhaps prepare the way for a closer union in the future, or if not, then to secure co-operation in such measures as may be jointly carried forward without affecting their present denominational features.

It seems somewhat singular that the Dutch Reformed Church should have waited so long (the Circular was adopted a year ago) without presenting it to the Synod of the German Reformed Church. It was received with favor by the General Assemblies,

and committees were appointed to take in charge the details of having its request carried out.

These facts, and others that might be referred to, indicate a desire for union among the divided Churches of Protestantism. There is no doubt that the result of the late civil war is exciting an influence, though it may be unconsciously, upon the spirit of the Churches. National life and the life of the Church are very closely related. The tendency generally has been to form national churches. This has not been done in this country, but the strong desire for union which was strengthened and sustained by the war, is calculated to bring in its train a tendency towards union in all departments of life. Beyond this mere sentiment or feeling we can see little brought out in these movements for union.

Strange enough the Presbyterians are determined to unite, though the doctrinal position of each School remains unchanged. Their efforts thus far have clearly developed the fact, that the difference or antithesis, which was once considered sufficiently solemn and serious to rend the Church asunder, is not at all reconciled, nay, that any attempt to touch it would defeat the movement for union. After attempting to come together by adopting an explicit platform, and failing, they now resolve to let the opposition or difference rest, and come together at any rate. The Scriptures and the Confession of Faith, that is all, and that is just what they had in 1838, when they quarrelled as to which interpreted them rightly. This, we say, looks somewhat strange. We do not find fault with it. We rather think they are now acting right; but then they are convicting the action of their fathers, in making the separation, of great thoughtlessness and folly. They never should have divided on differences which certainly in no way impair the soundness of their Creed.

But it is just here that their theologians differ from the clergy generally, and the people. They do see a serious and a dangerous difference, and they have, therefore, very generally resisted the re-union so long as the difference remains unadjusted. The larger portion of the clergy and the people are moved

mainly by their feeling in the case, and seeing no patent obstacle in the way, they are resolved for once, to make the theologians yield. "It will be pleasant to be together once more, we will be so much stronger, and can build up Presbyterianism with so much better success." Well, we hope they may get along peacefully together. Their denominational spirit is strong enough to overbalance a good many influences towards disunion. Let them now work harmoniously together to give Calvin's system, as interpreted by them, its full force and meaning in American Christianity.

We do not expect to see Presbyterianism become less denominational or sectarian, and more Catholic in its spirit, than it was before. Rather we expect it to become more partisan. That is one of the necessary evils that go along with the strengthening of Christianity in the *denominational* form in which we have it in this country. If Presbyterianism was exclusive, and narrow, and bigoted before, it is likely to become more so hereafter. The same would be the case, doubtless, with any of the other denominations, to a greater or less extent. It is perhaps more characteristic of Presbyterianism than some other phases of Protestant Christianity to be narrow and intolerant. This comes from the one-sided development of Calvinism in that denomination. They seem to have inherited Calvin's severity and intolerance, without some of his more Catholic and churchly traits. But, with some difference of degree, the strengthening of any other denomination would be attended with the same disposition. Denominational Christianity is not Catholic, but partial and more or less narrow in its spirit.

The problem, therefore, remains as to how denominational prejudices are to be overcome, and denominational life superseded by a life more catholic and free. This problem is not touched by the movements towards union now going on. Dr. Stearns does indeed point out in his sermon the necessity for a broader generalization, by which, when family centres are once formed, these families, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, &c., may be gathered together in one general organization, but he points out no principle on which this end is likely

to be reached. The probability is, that when once these leading denominations become thus strengthened and intrenched in their strongholds, finding that no one could hope to absorb the others, they would strive to form some terms of mutual alliance, and thus the real divisions would be perpetuated. Evidently the case requires something more than this.

Looking, now, away from these outward arrangements for denominational co-operation and confederation, is there not a more inward movement noticeable in Protestantism, which carries with it more promise of church unity? We think there is. There are *tendencies* at work which, to our mind, are more important than any merely outward alliances between the denominations. Reformations in the Church do not come through resolutions of conventions,—they are not legislated or made, but they are born. Hence, for every advance in the Church, there are always preparations in the inward life.

There is coming to be a marked tendency in Protestantism towards what we may call churchliness, a growing disposition to look for something more than the merely subjective upon which to rest. Christianity is felt to be an objective life, and the Church a supernatural constitution, or order of grace. There is in various directions a disposition manifested to bring back much that has been cast away in the extreme Protestant movement. Without lessening in any way the importance which Protestantism has taught men to attach to the subjective factor, to experience, to repentance, faith, etc., it is felt that there is another factor which must be recognized, in order that experience may be worth any thing. The holy ministry, the sacraments, the preached word, the order of worship, the Creed, these are looked to as standing in a real, objective, kingdom, in which Christians are born and nourished.

These tendencies are deeper than mere denominational life. Hence the apparent contradiction, that certain denominations are dividing, and others are giving forth tokens of coming divisions, while these other union movements are going on. The explanation, however, is not difficult. The Church will not come together on a false basis. In the Episcopalian Church

the antagonism of these opposing tendencies threatens division. In the Lutheran Church the division has taken place.

These tendencies, moreover, give rise to new sympathies that ignore denominational lines. A few evangelicals, so called, whether in the Reformed or Lutheran Church, will affiliate with the rationalistic wing of Protestantism in other denominations, while they rebel against the sound churchly feeling and life of their own denominations. And so, too, there is more real, and earnest sympathy between the churchly elements in these two denominations, than each has with the rationalistic spirit in its own denomination. The German Reformed Church could much more easily unite with the General Council Lutherans, than with a Reformed Church which stands in the spirit of Puritanism; and we have heard General Synod Lutheran ministers say that *their* people are more Presbyterian in sympathy than Lutheran, in the old historical sense. So, New Measure Lutherans would feel quite at home in the Methodist Church, and *vice versa*.

It is evident from these considerations, that there are undercurrents of life at work in the Protestant Church, which may eventually bring about new combinations, and resolve the conflict in Protestantism to a struggle between two prevailing tendencies. And we regard this conflict as far more important for the future of Protestantism than all the manoeuvring between denominations to effect unions where there is no inward sympathy and agreement. Many of these denominations have lost their original, historical character, and their continuance under the old name is but a burlesque on their origin. Even at best, denominational lines are but temporary. They must eventually pass away. Why then should not the attention of those, who work and pray, not only for the interest of a denomination, but for the whole Protestant interest, be directed to the one great issue here presented?

So far as faith is concerned, there ought to be no difficulty for all who stand in hearty sympathy with the Church of all ages, to rally around the Apostles' Creed. Let it, in its ancient historical sense, become authority for our modern confessions,

and we have once more a common starting point. Those who are in true sympathy with it would be able at least to understand each other, and when the Creed is again held up as containing the faith once delivered to the saints, the people will again say, we do hear these men speak in our own language.

Some may be impatient, and think that there is a shorter and easier way to union. It has become an axiom with certain ones, that creeds and theologies must be set aside before any union can take place. That is not our view. We have more faith in life movements, in tendencies, in earnest struggle, engaged in with faith to overcome the inner antagonisms of our common Protestant Christianity, than in all the outward conventional arrangements that are made under the impulse of mere feeling. They are made in a day, and in a day they come to nought.

This Churchly tendency, or Church movement as it has been called, forms a far more important feature in the history of the Protestant Church in our day, than all the unions and alliances which look to a patching up of our miserable sect system. It is a broad and general movement, showing that it comes, not from outward influences, or calculations of utility, but from a real inward growth in the life of the Church. It has been working with immense effect in England, it occupies men's thoughts in Germany, and it is showing itself in various directions in America. Indeed we are hardly conscious of the change that has been wrought in this country by this tendency, within the last twenty years. This change may be explained partly by a more liberal spirit having been infused into the churches of this country through communication with the Christianity of the old world, and especially by the large infusion of German theology. But this is not the whole explanation. There is evidently a reaction going on in the life of the church in this country; and this reaction forms a tendency which is growing every year, and is becoming more powerful than denominational attachments.

The presence of this churchly tendency appears in almost every historical denomination, in the two sides, or schools, the old and the new. Thus we have high and low-church Episcopalian, old and new Lutherans, in the Methodist Church a

settling down to a more steady spirit, a growing attention to the religious training of the young, &c., and in the Presbyterian Church also there are some minds that begin to look in this direction. The Dutch Reformed Church is at least trying to find out wherein it differs from Puritanism and Presbyterianism, and is more disposed now than formerly to speak of the liturgy and the import of the sacraments. The German Reformed Church is very generally pervaded by this tendency, and to it is mainly owing its new vigor.

Of course we can specify but a few of the indications of what we have referred to. Others, such as the great change going on in church architecture, the respect for the creeds and customs of the early church, &c., will suggest themselves to the reader.

Over against this tendency, there is arrayed another spirit. The radical, subjective, individualistic spirit, which is tending with great force towards humanitarianism, and which seems to be gathering up into itself the elements of rationalism and infidelity; this spirit arrays itself against the tendency of which we have spoken. This spirit, we say, tends with great force towards humanitarianism. It does so just because it ignores the objective factor in Christianity. It flourishes for a time as pietism, but taking no other ground for its activity than experience, it soon shows its weakness, and leads to fanaticism. Seeing this, the intelligent soon come to look upon it as only one of the exhibitions of man's religious nature, and it is then classed alongside other religious developments, and thus Christianity, in the minds of these persons, finds its place as only a religious system among others. Thus it has led to infidelity in New England with such men as Parker, Emerson, &c. There are, indeed, many who earnestly protest against the consequences, but their protests are powerless so long as they stand in the false system.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

CHIPS FROM A GERMAN WORKSHOP, by Max Müller, M. A., Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. Two vols. New York : Charles Scribner & Co.

A truly expressive title for a most admirable book, or rather series of books. More than twenty years ago the celebrated Bunsen succeeded, after much literary diplomacy, in persuading the directors of the East India Company to provide for publishing the Rig-veda, to the translation of which, with a commentary, Max Müller, with true German industry and perseverance, has been devoting his life. When Bunsen informed him of the arrangement which he had made, he said to Müller ; "Now you have a work for life—a large block that will take you years to plane and polish. But mind, let us have from time to time, some chips from your workshop."

And here are some of the chips, in two volumes of between three and four hundred pages each, on topics that must awaken the deepest interest of each student and lover of his race.

The essays in the first volume, may be regarded as contributions to "the science of religion." The author rightly, we think, regards religion as the deepest interest of humanity, and the study of the world's religion, as offering one of the most important fields for the study of the history of our race. "Every religion, even the most imperfect and degraded, has something that ought to be sacred to us ; for there is in all religions a secret yearning after the true though unknown God. Whether we see the Papua squatting in dumb meditation before his fetish, or whether we listen to Firdusi exclaiming, 'The height and depth of the whole world have their centre in Thee, O, my God ! I do not know Thee what Thou art ; but I know that Thou art what Thou alone canst be,' we ought to feel that the place whereon we stand is holy ground."

The new discoveries and study of the sacred books of religions of Eastern Asia, certainly have opened up a new chapter in the study of world-religions. The materials are thus being gathered for the construction of a science in this department. The only true religion need not shun any new light, that may be reflected from this quarter, but rather welcome it.

True, there are some who are ready to go off in enthusiasm whenever anything in a heathen religion turns up, which seems to contain the same truths as the Christian religion, and certain ones may seek

to turn this into an argument, to prove that this latter is only a religion among religions, but this argument in the end, can and will be turned with increasing power the other way. Thus the heathen mythology of Greece and Rome, has furnished the very best arguments for the truth of the one true religion. Such writers as James Freeman Clarke, and others in the *Atlantic Monthly*, are seeking to turn the argument in another direction, to prove, namely, that the religion of Christ is one in kind, though more perfect than these heathen religions. We may admit their premises, but the conclusion which they draw may be easily overthrown. Religion, on its human side, has a common basis in our nature; but one only is absolute, because it is revealed in Jesus Christ, while all others are merely projections of man's want. We, therefore, welcome so learned and reliable a contribution as this of Max Müller.

The second volume, bearing in the same direction, is occupied in giving new and more rational explanations of the heathen mythology. The author finds these explanations in the new discoveries that are being made in the languages of primitive tribes and nations. Especially does he find great help in the study of the Sanskrit, which throws new light on the Greek and Latin tongues. The only fault we find here is that he rationalizes too much. The element of mystery inheres in all religions, and we wrong them when we attempt to rule this out.

We know of few recent publications that will better repay perusal and study than these volumes of Max Müller. As such we commend them to the readers of the *REVIEW*.

THE LIFE AND EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL, Conybeare & Howson, complete and Unabridged Edition; Two volumes in one. C. Scribner & Co. 1869.

It seems that some one has sent out to the public an abridged and imperfect edition of this standard work. This has induced Mr. Scribner to issue the original and complete work, which was originally published in two volumes, in one large volume. In this form it contains all, even the valuable maps, which it contained in the first form, while at the same time it is rendered cheaper, and may be purchased by a larger number of readers. We have for years had the first work in our library, and regarded it as one of the very best on this subject. It is exhaustive. It will not likely be superseded. Those who have it not, and desire a complete work on the Life and Epistles of the great Apostle to the Gentiles, should procure it. And we would urge them to get this volume in place of any one less complete.

THE CONTROVERSY BETWEEN TRUE AND PRETENDED CHRISTIANITY. An essay delivered before the Massachusetts Methodist Convention held in Boston, Oct. 15, 1868, by Rev. L. T. Towns-

end, Hist. Professor Theol. in the Boston Theol. Sem., Boston: James P. Magee, No. 5, Cornhill, 1869.

This is a tract of 82 pages, intended to bring out the issue between orthodoxy, and New England Unitarianism.

New England is rapidly lapsing into a form of Christianity, which is little better, perhaps more dangerous, than open infidelity. The virus which is corrupting it, is *humanitarianism*, a hydra which lifts its numerous heads in all the ages of Christianity, a new one appearing as rapidly as one is cut off. It now leagues itself with German Rationalism, whose research and learning it borrows.

We are glad to see the issue broadly made by this Methodist Seminary, but we cannot say that the author, in this tract, gets far into the merits of the question. It is not enough to merely point out where this rationalism departs from orthodoxy. The case requires that the old conception of the Church shall be held up to confront it. Until this is done, as it has not been done as yet in New England, we have little hope of seeing the current turned.

WOMAN AS GOD MADE HER; The true Woman, by Rev. J. D. Fulton, to which is added, *Woman vs. Ballot*, Boston: Lea & Shepherd, 1869.

A pamphlet of fifty pages, in which the author treats of, 1. Woman as God made her; 2. Woman as a helpmeet; 3. Woman as a tempter; 4. The glory of motherhood; 5. Mariolatry not of Christ; 6. Woman's work, and woman's mission; 7. Woman vs. Ballot. It is written in good style, and breathes a sound Christian spirit. The subject of which it treats is engaging no small share of public attention. The prevalence of theories in regard to woman, and her sphere and mission inimical to plain teachings of Scripture, seems to render it necessary to speak on this subject. We think that those of the female sex, who seek to reverse the order of nature, and bring woman into the arena of politics and public life, tearing her away from the sanctuary of the home circle, are really the greatest enemies of their sex.

BAPTISM vs. IMMERSION.—A pamphlet of thirty-eight pages, containing a Review of the New Testament of the Immersionists, by George B. Jewett. This essay appeared first in the *Congregational Review*, and has been published in its present form, for more general circulation, which it certainly merits. We regard it as unanswerable. The Baptist denomination have been anxious to produce a new translation of the New Testament, for a long time. It may be the time is coming when a new translation will be produced which will supersede the present one; for it is far from being perfect. We think this review fully establishes the failure of this candidate for the honor. The subject is handled with the masterly ability which it merits. The tract is published by G. M. Whipple, & A. A. Smith, Salem, Mass.

A MANUAL OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA, by Edward Tanjore Corwin, Pastor at Millstone, N. J., second edition, Revised and Enlarged, New York: Board of Publication of Reformed Church, 103 Fulton street, 1869.

An excellent hand-book of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, of about 400 pages, containing a Historical Introduction. We cannot agree with the author, that the Heidelberg Catechism and the Westminster Confession, are substantially identical in doctrine, and that the only difference is, that the one is composed from a philosophical, the other from an experimental stand-point.

The book then treats of The Ministry, The Churches, The Classes, Synods, Institutions, and Boards. It contains much valuable information. The reference to German ministers is based on Harbaugh's Fathers of the Reformed Church, and his life of Schlatter. To be had at the Publication House of the Reformed Church, 54, N. 6th street, Phila.

STUDIES IN PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY, by Joseph Haven, D.D., Professor in Chicago Theol. Sem. Andover: Warren F. Draper, Main street, 1869.

Subjects treated: 1. Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton; 2. Mill versus Hamilton; 3. The Moral Faculty; 4. Province of Imagination in Sacred Oratory; 5. The Ideal and the Actual.

Studies in Theology; 1. Natural Theology; 2. The Doctrine of the Trinity; 3. Theology as a Science; 4. Miracles; 5. Sin, as related to human nature and the divine mind; 6. Arianism. To be obtained at Smith, English & Co., 23 North Sixth street, Philadelphia.

THE LIFE OF CAIN, by Rev. Isaac K. Loos, Author of "*Salome the Dancer*." Philadelphia: S. R. Fisher & Co., 54, North Sixth street.

The subject here selected by the respected author is both new and interesting. Many lives have been written since men began to make books (of which, Solomon says there is no end), but no one, so far as we know, ever before wrote the life of Cain. Yet why should his biography not be written? Is it because so little is known of him? Read this little work and see how much can be known, or at least profitably thought of, from the few hints and facts given in the inspired record. Is it because he was a wicked man? But the Bible itself gives us the lives of the wicked as well as the good. Valuable lessons of warning may be derived from such lives. The author gleans in departments of sacred Scripture, which, for the most part, have been overlooked by other writers. His success here shows, that he might find something fresh and new even where others have gleaned. Salome the Dancer, and Cain, we have now from his pen. We hope he may give the Church yet other results of his studies.

Much in the life of Cain, of course, must be a matter of supposi-

tion or probability. The author, however, has given us no wild fancies, but only such probable things as sound reason and the circumstances surrounding life in that early age of the world, fully warrant. The style is chaste. The foot-notes in one or two instances quote authorities for what, it seemed to us, is sufficiently plain without any support beyond the author's own assertion. If our estimation, or judgment, is of any account with him, we give it in candor when we say, that the author of the "Life of Cain," and "Salome the Dancer," has not mistaken his vocation, in placing his name among the authors (the list is a worthy one) of the Reformed Church.

CREED AND CUSTOMS: A Popular Hand-Book, treating of the chief Doctrines and Practices of the Reformed Church, in the U. S., by George B. Russell, A. M. Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publication Board, No. 54, North Sixth street.

This is a solid volume of 467 pages, by one well known in the Reformed Church, the editor of the book department of our establishment in Philadelphia. It is one of the first volumes issued since the establishment of this department in our Publishing House, and certainly is well worthy of an extensive circulation. As it may be made the subject of an article for a future number of the REVIEW, we shall not enter upon an extensive consideration of the important topics of which it treats now.

The Reformed Church, since its first proper beginning in the Palatinate, as a leading branch of the Protestant Church, has passed through many and severe trials, not the least of which was the withering influence of Rationalism and fanatical Pietism. In its struggle with this double enemy, it came off victorious. As a result, it came to a proper consciousness of its life and genius, and now seeks earnestly to fulfill its true mission. This volume of Mr. Russell gives a full and fair statement of this consciousness, as the Church stood at the close of the Tercentenary Jubilee in this country. So far as we have been able to examine it, we believe it is a faithful statement of our Creed and Customs at the present time. The style is clear and strong, the sentiment decided, and altogether the book contains just such information as our own people greatly need, and we hope it may find many readers outside our own denomination. Let the Church see to it that its circulation be as general as it so amply merits. The editor has led the way in performing a labor for the Church, which must result in immense good. Let him be properly sustained by other writers, and means to carry it on successfully, and the blessed fruits will soon appear throughout the Church.

WATERLOO; A sequel to The Conscript of 1813, translated from the French of Erekman-Chatrian, with six full page illustrations New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

At the close of The Story of a Conscript, the author makes Joseph

say: "If people of sense tell me that I have done well in relating my campaign of 1813—that my story may show youth the vanity of military glory, and prove that no man can gain happiness save by peace, liberty, and labor—then I will take up my pen once more, and give you the story of Waterloo!"

The good report of people of good sense came, and here is Waterloo. Many a story of it has been told. We remember hearing an intensely interesting one from Rev. D. Willers, a father in the ministry of the Reformed Church, who himself was in the great battle. But this book tells it as few writers can. If any one wants books that combine the fascination of the best works of fiction with facts and history, or if any parents wish to place in the hands of their children reading which will please and profit them, without any injury resulting, but much good, then get *The Story of a Conscript and Waterloo*.

FOREIGN MISSIONS; THEIR RELATIONS AND CLAIMS, by Rufus Anderson, D.D., LLD, Late Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 1869.

This is a volume of 373 pages, gotten up in neat and plain style. It contains a series of lectures delivered in the Theol. Seminaries at Andover, Princeton, Bangor, Hartford, Auburn, and New York city (Union Seminary).

The subject treated, must always possess peculiar interest for the Christian Church. Just now, also, when the whole of Eastern Asia, with its teeming millions, is brought so near to us, it is invested with new interest. Young men preparing for the ministry especially should read and ponder its truths.

THE STORY OF FATHER MILLER, written for his Young Friends, by Franz Hoffman, translated by Lewis Henry Steiner. Philadelphia: Reformed Church Publication Board, 54, North Sixth street.

Another book from the Reformed Church Publication Board. It looks well—comes from the German, and is put in English dress, by one who understands the work. It is published by the fund of the Trinity Sunday-school of the Reformed Church, York, Pa.

Let no one think it is a story of the admirable and beloved pastor in York. To call him Father Miller, might be regarded by some as Romanizing, though every Protestant minister is a Father to his flock, just as much as a Romish priest. No, it is an interesting story of honesty, and pious trust in Providence, by a true and good man in the *Vaterland*. Of course the Sunday-schools will all get it. And many a one older and more learned than Sunday-school boys and girls will read it with pleasure and profit.